

Binding

The Department of State

bulletin

Vol. XXVI, No. 667

April 7, 1952

A REVIEW OF POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CON-
DITIONS IN FRANCE • *by David K. E. Bruce* . . . 533

HOW CAN WE DEFEND FREE CULTURE? • *by*
Assistant Secretary Sargeant . . . 535

A COMMON RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVING
"HEALTH SECURITY" • *by Assistant Secretary*
Thorp . . . 541

THE U. S. FOREIGN SERVICE—*A Career for Young*
Americans . . . 549

THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE . . . 523



For index see back cover



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXVI, No. 667 • PUBLICATION 4557

April 7, 1952

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 22, 1952).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

An Article¹

The concept of a united Europe, which is many centuries old, gained renewed significance with the revival of interest in international and European organization after World War I. European unification was pressed by such private organizations as the Pan-European Union and also received support from some European statesmen such as Aristide Briand of France and Karl Renner of Austria. Briand's plan for a European union was carefully studied by the League of Nations but could not be put into operation because of the divisive effects of the world depression and the rise of totalitarian states.

During World War II interest in European union again revived. In 1944 the governments-in-exile of Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg signed a treaty which provided for their eventual economic union. Immediately after the war numerous popular groups arose to rally public sentiment behind European unification. These groups, most of whom later united to form what was called the European Movement, claimed the support of such prominent political leaders as Paul-Henri Spaak, Winston Churchill, Carlo Sforza, Georges Bidault, and Paul Ramadier.

Economic dislocation in the war-torn countries and the fear of aggression brought increased cooperation among the nations of Europe in the economic and military fields. The United Nations Economic Commission for Europe was organized soon after the war to assist rehabilitation and to further economic cooperation among European countries. The Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), formed in April 1948 among the Marshall Plan countries, worked toward European recovery and closer economic cooperation among the member states. The Brus-

sels Pact, signed in March 1948, laid the basis for military cooperation and for consultation on other major problems affecting the five participants, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands.

These developments were, however, insufficient to satisfy the supporters of European union. The French Parliament in March 1948 passed a resolution calling for a European constituent assembly to establish a European federation. In May 1948 a congress of the European Movement met at The Hague and passed a resolution supporting the formation of a European parliament. Although the European Movement was a nongovernmental organization composed of private groups, nearly every country sent all-party delegations sponsored by the political parties.

Creation of the Council of Europe

In August 1948 the French Government invited the other Brussels pact powers to meet for consideration of the formation of a European parliament. The British were reluctant to support the idea of an assembly, preferring rather a committee of ministers. However, after considerable negotiation, the Brussels pact powers agreed upon a compromise and decided to create a Council of Europe composed of two organs, a Committee of Ministers, which would make recommendations to the member governments upon unanimous agreement, and a Consultative Assembly, which would be a deliberative body empowered to discuss problems and make recommendations to the Committee of Ministers. In the spring of 1949 five other European countries were invited to join with these powers in working out final details for the creation of the Council of Europe. On May 5, 1949, the Statute of the Council of Europe was signed by the 10 original members.

¹ This article also appears as Foreign Affairs Outline, Department of State publication 4492, for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D. C., for 5¢.

Membership

The original members of the Council of Europe were France, the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Italy, and Ireland. Greece and Turkey were invited to become members during the first session in 1949, and they joined immediately. Iceland, which had been invited at the same time, became a member in March 1950. A few months later, in 1950, the German Federal Republic and the Saar were given associate memberships, which entitled them to representation in the Consultative Assembly but not in the Committee of Ministers. On May 2, 1951, the German Federal Republic was admitted to full membership in the Council of Europe.

Purpose and Role

According to the Statute of the Council, the aim of the Council is to "achieve unity between its Members for the purpose of safeguarding and realizing the ideals and principles which are their common heritage and facilitating their economic and social progress." To this end it is to discuss questions of common concern and reach agreements for "common action in economic, social, cultural, scientific, legal and administrative matters and in the maintenance and further realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms." Defense is the only field in which the Statute precludes the Council from making recommendations to member governments.

At the time the Council of Europe was formed, other organizations many of whose functions were similar to those of the Council of Europe, such as UNESCO, the International Labor Organization (ILO), and OEEC, were already in existence. In order to avoid duplication of the work of these organizations, article 23 of the Statute provides that in planning its agenda the Assembly "shall have regard to the work of other European inter-governmental organizations to which some or all of the Members of the Council are parties." Agreements are now being worked out for cooperation between the Council of Europe and ILO and UNESCO. Representatives from OEEC and the Council of Europe form a liaison committee between OEEC and the Council, one of whose functions is to coordinate the activities of the two bodies.

The role of the Council of Europe is not limited to the specific projects which it originates and implements. Of equal importance is its role as a stimulus to unified action, a constructive critic, and a rallying point for European public opinion.

In its role as a stimulus to action, the Council of Europe may direct attention to the need for coordinated, expanded, or redirected action in a particular field such as that of refugees and surplus population. Although, as the problem is examined, it may sometimes develop that the Council of Europe is not the organization best equipped to carry out the particular program, the Council will have served its purpose by stimulating action.

The role of the Council of Europe as a constructive critic is increasing, and the Committee of Ministers is now considering means of further developing this side of the Council's work. OEEC now submits a report on its activities for discussion in the Assembly. The Schuman Plan treaty likewise provides that the High Authority of the proposed Coal and Steel Community shall submit its annual report to the Committee of Ministers and the Consultative Assembly and that the Common Assembly of the Community shall submit an annual report to the Consultative Assembly.

Paul-Henri Spaak has called the Consultative Assembly "the Tribune of Europe." Here 15 different European viewpoints can be focused on the major problems confronting Europe, and the spotlight of public opinion can be directed to these issues. In carrying out this function of rallying public opinion, the Consultative Assembly has a role unique among European organizations.

Organs and Procedures of the Council

THE ORGANS OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE AND THEIR FUNCTIONS

The major organs of the Council of Europe are the Consultative Assembly and the Committee of Ministers. In addition, a Joint Committee, composed of representatives from the Committee of Ministers and the Consultative Assembly, discusses mutual problems and seeks to eliminate any conflicts between the two organs. A secretariat, headed by Secretary General Jacques-Camille Paris, services these bodies.

The Committee of Ministers, the "upper body" of the Council, is composed of the Foreign Ministers of the member states or their deputies. The chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers

rotates among the members. Among the statesmen who have represented their countries in the Committee of Ministers are Dirk Stikker of the Netherlands, Count Carlo Sforza of Italy, Konrad Adenauer of Germany, and Robert Schuman of France.

All recommendations made by the Council of Europe to the member governments require the unanimous approval of the Committee of Ministers. Major substantive decisions require a unanimous vote, but certain minor matters can be settled by a two-thirds majority. Actually, most decisions are reached by unanimous agreement without the formality of a vote. The Ministers have recently adopted a procedure slightly modifying the unanimity rule, which will allow "partial agreements," i.e. agreements among certain members which do not bind those who abstain. Recommendations made by the Council of Europe are not legally binding on the member governments, but, of course, since they are made by high-level representatives they would normally be reflected in the policy of the governments.

Sessions of the Committee of Ministers are held before and after each session of the Assembly and on such other occasions as the Ministers may decide. Thus far, the Committee has met approximately four times a year. The meetings of the Committee of Ministers are held in private unless the Ministers unanimously decide otherwise.

The Consultative Assembly is a purely deliberative body in which each country is represented according to relative size. The delegations vary in number from 18 for France, Italy, Germany, and the United Kingdom to 3 for the Saar and Iceland. In the past delegations were selected by member governments by whatever means they chose. Delegates were almost always members of the national parliament and frequently were chosen by the political parties. Members of opposition parties, except the Communist, have been regularly included in the delegations. Under a new amendment to the Statute, delegates will henceforth be selected by parliaments or in a manner approved by parliaments rather than by the executive branch of the member governments. Among the European political leaders who have represented their countries in the Consultative Assembly are Georges Bidault, Winston Churchill, Finn Moe, and Carlo Schmid. Paul-Henri Spaak has served three terms as President of the Consultative Assembly.

Each member of the Consultative Assembly is seated and votes as an individual rather than as a member of a country bloc, an unusual procedure among international organizations. This has meant in practice that members of national delegations can usually be found on different sides of any issue.

The Assembly may debate any matter within the scope of the Council. Matters for debate may either originate in the Consultative Assembly or be referred to it by the Committee of Ministers. On the basis of such debates and the work of its committees, the Assembly adopts recommendations for consideration by the Committee of Ministers. A recommendation requires a two-thirds vote before it can be submitted to the Committee of Ministers.

Originally, the Consultative Assembly met once a year for one month at Strasbourg, France, the seat of the Council of Europe. The long time-lag between its yearly sessions retarded consideration of problems, particularly those of primary interest to the Assembly. Therefore in 1950 the Assembly split its one-month session and, after meeting first in August, reconvened in November to consider the action the Committee of Ministers had taken on its recommendations. This procedure was followed again in 1951 and will probably continue to be the practice.

The Standing Committee of the Consultative Assembly is responsible for Assembly activities during the period between sessions. It is composed of the Bureau of the Assembly, i.e. its President and Vice Presidents, and 23 representatives from the Assembly. Urgent problems requiring prompt consideration by the relevant Assembly committees are brought to their attention by this body. The Standing Committee also supervises the implementation of Assembly decisions and coordinates the activities of the various committees.

HOW A RECOMMENDATION IS CONSIDERED

A subject for consideration by the Council of Europe can originate in either of the two major organs. Although a proposal may originate in the Committee of Ministers and be submitted to member governments without reference to the Assembly, such a procedure would be rare. Most recommendations studied by the Council of Europe have originated in the Consultative Assembly. Upon presentation, a motion is ordinarily sent to

the appropriate Assembly committee for a report. The committees of the Assembly are political rather than technical bodies. If the motion raises complex social and economic questions, members of the committee may consult informally with experts in the field or members of interested organizations and sometimes will work out the formal details of a proposal in conjunction with another international group. For example, the Draft Convention on the Reciprocal Treatment of Nationals now under consideration was prepared in cooperation with the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law. A draft report on a motion usually must receive a two-thirds vote in committee before it is presented to the Assembly.

After a proposal has been approved in the Assembly, it is normally transmitted to the Committee of Ministers. In certain cases, however, where the Assembly has been anxious to bring parliamentary support to bear on the Committee of Ministers, representatives have first introduced recommendations in their own parliaments for debate, in the hope that public and parliamentary sentiment would be aroused in support of the proposal. When a proposal is presented to the Committee of Ministers, the Ministers may review the broad political implications of a proposal; but, if the general principle is acceptable, they usually prefer to have specific provisions studied by experts before taking any final decision.

In order to avoid duplication of effort, the Committee of Ministers may refer certain recommendations of the Assembly to other organizations such as OEEC and request a report on action already undertaken or contemplated.

After study by the secretariat or government experts the proposal is again considered by the Ministers. After general approval by the Committee of Ministers, the detailed or revised proposal may be returned to the Consultative Assembly or the Standing Committee for comment. If there is conflict over particular points, representatives from the Assembly and from the Committee of Ministers attempt to reach agreement in the Joint Committee.

A proposal agreed upon by the Council may be implemented in several different ways. It may be carried out by the member governments themselves, or action on it may be taken by the Council of Europe itself, either alone or in cooperation with other organizations. In certain cases other

organizations of which these countries are members may be asked to implement a recommendation.

Basic Problems and Activities of the Council

In the brief period since its formation in May 1949, the Council of Europe has led an existence marked by controversy. Even before the internal organization of the Council had been established, it was torn by conflict over its functions, its powers, and its purpose. Conflict over the method by which European cooperation could best be achieved was accompanied by differences of view between the Consultative Assembly and the Committee of Ministers. Spirited debates on these topics have centered primarily around the problem of revision of the Statute of the Council of Europe.

The differences in approach to the problem of European unity which were reflected in the organization of the Council of Europe are clearly evident in this controversy. In the Assembly, most of the representatives from the continental powers favor a federal approach, which would require certain sacrifices of national sovereignty. Although the majority of the federalists now accept the fact that a federation including all of Western Europe cannot be attained immediately, they consider that supranational powers can be given to bodies which will be empowered to administer particular segments or "functions" in the European economy. These are considered to be preliminary steps toward the long-range goal. This group has been especially active in pushing for amendments to enlarge the functions and powers of both the Council and the Consultative Assembly. The British and Scandinavians, sometimes called "functionalists," oppose plans which would call for sacrifices of sovereignty, preferring that specific problems be worked out on an intergovernmental basis.

The debate on the problem of European federation reached a climax in November 1950. During the first half of the session the previous summer, the British and Scandinavian delegates had told the others to go ahead with regional federation if they so desired. At the session in the fall of 1950, a proposal advocating regional federation was defeated in committee, although the British and the Scandinavians did not oppose it. Many of those who had previously supported federation were opposed to a federation in which the British would not participate.

Although the question of radical revision of the Statute was thus settled at least temporarily, pressure for other revisions continued to command the interest of the Assembly. Many of these recommendations for amendment had been pending since the first session of the Assembly, and the lack of action by the Ministers on this matter had proved a major irritant in the relations between the Assembly and the Ministers. Many representatives, eager to see concrete progress made, felt that their recommendations had been either ignored or dealt with in a perfunctory or dilatory fashion. On the occasions of the Ministers' regular reports to the Consultative Assembly, some representatives voiced bitter attacks against the Committee of Ministers and the states which they thought had taken particularly negative positions. The Joint Committee, established in mid-1950, however, brought greater understanding between the two organs.

At the sixth session of the Committee of Ministers in November 1950, the Ministers accepted the principle of specialized authorities and revision of the Statute. A committee of senior officials was then established to review the changes suggested by the Assembly.

During the interim between November and the session in May 1951, a series of steps were taken which were to result in decided improvement of relations between the Consultative Assembly and the Committee of Ministers at the spring session. Although not accepting the amendments regarding the abolition of veto or elimination of the restriction on defense, the Ministers did agree upon a number of amendments, which for the most part embodied the Assembly's wishes on such questions as agenda and selection of representatives. The Ministers also reached agreement on a number of other questions including the admission of new members and the conclusions of conventions. Advances were also made toward closer relations with other European organizations. In early spring, a liaison committee between the Council of Europe and OEEC was established to facilitate exchange of information and to assist in harmonizing the activities of the two organizations. A further step was taken when it was agreed that OEEC would present regular reports to the Assembly. When the Schuman Plan treaty was signed in April, a protocol relating to relationships between the Council of Europe and the Coal and Steel Community was appended which took fully into account

the recommendations of the Assembly regarding reports and common membership in the Consultative Assembly and the Common Assembly of the Community.

At the ninth session of the Committee of Ministers in August 1951 agreement was reached, as noted above, to allow partial agreements which would permit certain decisions to apply only to those members accepting them.

Although substantial progress was made during 1951 toward improving relations between the Ministers and the Assembly and certain troublesome questions were laid aside, at least temporarily, the problems regarding the role of the Council and particularly the Assembly, although narrowed in scope, still require serious attention. At the session in November 1951 the Assembly discussed plans for specialized authorities in transport and agriculture, but it has already become clear that the same problem which arose regarding European federation is arising again with respect to specialized authorities—the problem of sovereignty. These general problems were paramount in the mind of Paul-Henri Spaak when, in discussing the role of the Assembly at the end of the first half of its 1951 session, he stated:

"To sum up: the constitutional approach has been abandoned; the functional (or specialized authorities) approach offers only limited possibilities; and the consultative method is not working satisfactorily. . . . All this, I think, makes it necessary for those who believe in the paramount necessity of the Council of Europe to give thought to its future and to try and work out once and for all the road it ought to take."

Relation of United States to the Council

The Council of Europe is a purely European organization in which, as was indicated above, the United States does not participate. However, because the United States considers that the Council has an important role to play in furthering European unification, it has followed the activities of the Council with great interest. Since the inception of the European Recovery Program, the United States has emphasized the need for a closer integration of the free nations of Europe and has encouraged them to take steps toward this goal. The United States warmly welcomed the establishment of the Council as a further step in this direction.

On May 11, 1949, soon after the Statute of the Council of Europe was signed, Secretary Acheson stated:

"This act on the part of those nations is a welcome step forward toward the political integration of the free nations of Europe. The people of those nations are to be praised for their realization that a free Europe, to remain free and attain a higher degree of well-being, must be a united Europe."

Although the United States has no official relationship with the Council, members of Congress have met with representatives of the Assembly to discuss problems of concern to both the United States and the European countries. At its second session in the summer of 1950 the Assembly of the Council adopted a resolution expressing its wish that close cooperation between the countries of Europe and North America continue and requesting that close liaison be established between the European organizations and the nations of North America. In March 1951 the Committee of Ministers invited the Assembly to suggest ways in which this liaison might be established. Accordingly at its third session in May 1951 the Consultative Assembly invited a delegation from the Congress of the United States to meet with a delegation from the Assembly for a public discussion of problems of mutual interest. This invitation was accepted by the Congress, and, in November 1951, 7 members of the Senate and 7 members of the House of Representatives met with 18 delegates selected proportionately from among the various parliamentary delegations to the Assembly for an exchange of views on such problems as the development of European unity and the social and economic aspects of the current rearmament effort.

Major Accomplishments

Since the aim of the Council of Europe is to achieve greater European unity, which is often a very intangible thing not measurable merely by the various activities or institutional forms undertaken, it is difficult to assess the importance of the Council in terms of its concrete accomplishments. The Council had no assigned task other than that of achieving greater unity, since defense matters are excluded and action on economic matters is primarily the responsibility of other organizations such as OEEC. The changes in the Statute, even

though not radical in form, reflect progress toward the goal of unity, as do the agreement on specialized authorities and the growing habit of cooperation and consultation.

One of the main functions of the Council is to provide a forum for the discussion of major European problems. How much a debate affects a given course of events is difficult, if not impossible, to determine. Certainly the Assembly has focused the spotlight of public attention on some of the crucial issues of our times, ranging from inflation to the threat of aggression, and by this means has stimulated action on many practical problems.

For example, although the Council of Europe has no power to act in the field of defense, the spirited debate on this issue in August 1950, according to the statements of French Foreign Minister Schuman, had considerable effect on the future course of events. In outlining the Plevin Plan for a European army to the Consultative Assembly at Strasbourg in November 1950, he stated:

"But there is no need to put these questions to you whose very presence here is a challenge to orthodoxy; to you who by the vote you took here have testified to your support of the basic idea of our plan, nay more, who are its originator. This plan is essentially the one which you recommended."

The vigorous debates in the first session of the Assembly brought wider public attention to the problem of European economic integration and focused interest on the activities of OEEC. Strong support was given to the Schuman Plan for a coal and steel community which was debated in the Assembly both before and after the signature of the treaty.

On a number of other questions more definite action has been taken within the framework of the Council of Europe. Among these are the questions of human rights, refugees and surplus population, social security, patents, standardization of passports and abolition of visas, and a wide range of cultural problems.

A convention on human rights which would reflect those concepts basic to the democratic way of life was proposed at the first session of the Council of Europe in 1949 and signed at Rome on November 4, 1950. At its ninth session in August 1951 the Committee of Ministers agreed upon a protocol to the convention embodying rights of free elections, education, and property which the

Assembly had been especially anxious to have included in the convention itself.

After recommendations from the Assembly on the problem of refugees and the decision of the Ministers that the problem of refugees and overpopulation was one of extreme urgency whose existence impeded the aims of the Council of Europe, a committee of high-level experts of member governments was convened to examine the problem and determine what action might be taken. Experts from IRO, ILO, OEEC, and the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees have attended its meetings, and the United States, at the request of the Council, sent an observer to the second meeting of this group, held in September 1951.

In the social field the Council of Europe has agreed on the principle of framing a European code of social security in conjunction with ILO. The experts are now working out the general principles to be incorporated in the convention. They are also working on additional ratifications for ILO conventions, extension of the poor-law convention, and extension of social-security agreements concluded by the Brussels pact powers.

In the economic field, the Assembly has been studying the formation of specialized authorities concerned with transport and agriculture. Since these matters have been studied and debated in the Council of Europe, the interest of other Western European organizations in this field has increased. Other complex questions, such as the problem of full employment and cartels, have occupied the attention of working groups in the Council. A working party on patents has already brought to a successful conclusion its first task, that of unifying the procedures and formalities regarding the application for and the granting of patents among members of the Council. The group is now studying the creation of a European patents office and its integration with the International Patents Institute at The Hague.

The great expectations of the most ardent supporters of the Council of Europe who hoped that a European federation would quickly be created have clearly not been fulfilled. The Council has nevertheless played a useful role, in fact a unique role. Although it has taken only limited action on the most urgent problems of this period, it has demonstrated, through the Consultative Assembly, the power to arouse public opinion and stimulate

activity on a number of pressing issues. Through its efforts toward unified action on specific social, cultural, and economic problems, the Council is assisting in the effort to remove many real but unspectacular obstacles to European unity. Thus through public debate on broad issues and positive action on problems of narrower scope, the Council of Europe is providing a useful contribution to the growing sense of European unity.

Further Denial of Soviet "Germ Warfare" Allegations

[Released to the press March 26]

Statement by Secretary Acheson

At his news conference on March 26, Secretary Acheson was asked for comment on the statement, highly publicized by the Communists, of a group of jurists who claim to have "substantiated" the waging by United Nations forces in Korea of germ warfare.

Secretary Acheson made the following extemporaneous reply:

As I understand it, this group of very eminent jurists to which you refer are a group of Communists and former Nazis who have turned Communist, who have gone from East Germany into this area. That would not seem to imply any special impartiality or disinterest in their approach to it.

We have stated often, I have stated, General Ridgway has stated that there is not the slightest truth whatever in these statements.

We have asked the International Red Cross to make an investigation. We have offered all facilities to the Red Cross. The World Health Organization has proposed that it be used to make an investigation, also to attempt to deal with any epidemic if such an epidemic exists. We have supported that request. The Communists have never replied to either request.

It seems perfectly clear that the Communists are determined not to have any fair or impartial investigation made. They continue on the one hand to say there is no epidemic. On the other hand they say that we are engaged in these nefarious practices.

There is no truth in the statements. The fact that there is no truth is shown by the refusal of the Communists to permit any investigation by an impartial international body.

Reaffirmation of U.S. Policy Toward Germany

PRESS CONFERENCE STATEMENT BY SECRETARY ACHESON¹

On March 10, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko handed to Elim O'Shaughnessy, United States Chargé d'Affaires at Moscow, a note containing proposals for a treaty of peace with Germany. Identical notes were handed to the British and French Ambassadors at Moscow. On March 25 the U.S., British, and French Embassies at Moscow delivered identical notes of reply to the Soviet Government. There follow texts of a statement by Secretary Acheson and of the U.S. and Soviet notes.

I should like to anticipate your questions and speak for a moment on the reply to the Soviet note of March 10 on Germany which the representatives of the United States, United Kingdom, and France in Moscow delivered yesterday to the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

One of the primary purposes of the reply is to seek clarification of Soviet intentions with respect to procedures and conditions which would permit all-German elections, under international supervision, and the establishment of a democratic and free Germany. The Soviet note has dealt with this subject in an unclear manner and all our efforts during the past several years to obtain Soviet acceptance of satisfactory procedures have been unsuccessful. As pointed out in our note, it has seemed to us that Soviet cooperation with the U.N. Commission of Investigation would be especially significant as a touchstone of Soviet intentions.

When the Soviet Union suggests that the four powers "discuss" a German peace treaty, the U.S. Government cannot but be reminded of the 7 fruitless years of discussions with Soviet representatives about an Austrian treaty. It would be an encouraging augury for any future discussion about a German treaty if the Soviet Government were to respond favorably to the proposals for an Austrian treaty contained in the note of the United States Government of March 13.

The Soviet note has led the United States to reaffirm in its reply its policies toward Germany and Europe. The peace and prosperity of Europe demand that unity among its people shall supersede the play of national interests and national forces which have brought so much distress to the European Continent.

¹ Made on March 26.

Certain aspects of Soviet policy pursued since the close of the war have strongly tended to accent the need for a rapid development of a close European community. The U.S. Government has supported and will continue to support measures for the formation of a community in Europe designed to develop the economic strength and defensive capacity of the participating countries as a whole.

Germany must be allowed to play its part in building a strong European community capable of developing its freedoms and of defending itself from aggression or subversion. The U.S. Government is convinced that such a community is entirely defensive in character and purpose.

The Soviet proposal, with its emphasis on national forces, points to the past and away from the establishment of a new Europe in which national rivalries would be subordinated to the interests of the entire area. The U.S. Government firmly believes that the European approach represents the most constructive means of eliminating dangerous tensions. It has, accordingly, sought to make clear in its reply that it will not be deflected from pursuing this path of peace.

U.S. NOTE OF MARCH 25

The United States Government, in consultation with the Governments of the United Kingdom and France, has given the most careful consideration to the Soviet Government's note of March 10, 1952, which proposed the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany. They have also consulted the Government of the German Federal Republic and the representatives of Berlin.

The conclusion of a just and lasting peace treaty which would end the division of Germany has always been and remains an essential objective of the United States Government. As the Soviet Government itself recognizes, the conclusion of such a treaty requires the formation of an all-German Government, expressing the will of the German people. Such a Government can only be set up on the basis of free elections in the Federal Republic, the Soviet zone of occupation and Berlin. Such elections can only be held in circumstances which safeguard the national and individual liberties of the German people. In order to ascertain whether this first essential condition exists, the

Background References

The unification of Germany on the basis of free, democratic elections has always been strongly supported by the United States, the United Kingdom, and France. In February 1950, John J. McCloy, U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, proposed all-German elections for a constituent assembly. A chronological list of subsequent Allied proposals and of steps taken by the West German Government appeared in the BULLETIN of October 29, 1951, p. 695.

On October 4, 1951, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of West Germany requested the appointment of a U.N. commission to investigate whether conditions would permit the holding of nation-wide elections. A resolution establishing such a commission was introduced by the United States, United Kingdom, and France on December 1 during the sixth General Assembly session (BULLETIN of Dec. 24, 1951, p. 1019) and was adopted, with amendments, on December 20 (for text, see BULLETIN of Jan. 14, 1952, p. 55). The commission was constituted on February 11 and is to report to the Secretary-General not later than September 1, 1952.

Significant statements on the integration of Germany into the European community were made by the Western Foreign Ministers on May 14, 1950 (BULLETIN of May 22, 1950, p. 787); on September 19, 1950 (BULLETIN of Oct. 2, 1950, p. 530); on September 14, 1951 (BULLETIN of Sept. 24, 1951, p. 486); on November 22, 1951 (BULLETIN of Dec. 3, 1951, p. 891); and on February 19, 1952 (BULLETIN of Mar. 3, 1952, p. 325).

The Foreign Ministers announced in September 1950 their decision that the necessary steps should be taken to terminate the state of war with Germany. On October 19, 1951, the Congress resolved that the state of war between the United States and Germany was terminated, and the President on October 24 issued a proclamation to that effect (BULLETIN of Nov. 12, 1951, p. 769).

General Assembly of the United Nations has appointed a Commission to carry out a simultaneous investigation in the Federal Republic, the Soviet zone and Berlin. The Commission of Investigation has been assured of the necessary facilities in the Federal Republic and in Western Berlin. The United States Government would be glad to learn that such facilities will also be afforded in the Soviet zone and in Eastern Berlin, to enable the Commission to carry out its task.

The Soviet Government's proposals do not indicate what the international position of an all-German Government would be before the conclusion of a peace treaty. The United States Government considers that the all-German Government should be free both before and after the conclusion of a peace treaty to enter into associations compatible with the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

In putting forward its proposal for a German peace treaty, the Soviet Government expressed its readiness also to discuss other proposals. The United States Government has taken due note of this statement. In its view, it will not be possible to engage in detailed discussion of a peace treaty until conditions have been created for free elec-

tions and until a free all-German Government which could participate in such discussion has been formed. There are several fundamental questions which would also have to be resolved.

For example, the United States Government notes that the Soviet Government makes the statement that the territory of Germany is determined by frontiers laid down by the decisions of the Potsdam conference. The United States Government would recall that in fact no definitive German frontiers were laid down by the Potsdam decisions, which clearly provided that the final determination of territorial questions must await the peace settlement.

The United States Government also observes that the Soviet Government now considers that the peace treaty should provide for the formation of German national land, air, and sea forces, while at the same time imposing limitations on Germany's freedom to enter into association with other countries. The United States Government considers that such provisions would be a step backwards and might jeopardize the emergence in Europe of a new era in which international relations would be based on cooperation and not on rivalry and distrust. Being convinced of the need of a policy of European unity, the United States Government is giving its full support to plans designed to secure the participation of Germany in a purely defensive European community which will preserve freedom, prevent aggression, and preclude the revival of militarism. The United States Government believes that the proposal of the Soviet Government for the formation of German national forces is inconsistent with the achievement of this objective. The United States Government remains convinced that this policy of European unity cannot threaten the interests of any country and represents the true path of peace.

SOVIET NOTE OF MARCH 10

[Unofficial Translation]

The Soviet Government considers it necessary to direct the attention of the Government of the United States of America to the fact that although about seven years have passed since the end of the war in Europe a peace treaty with Germany is not yet concluded.

With the aim of eliminating such an abnormal situation the Soviet Government, supporting the communication of the Government of the German Democratic Republic to the Four Powers requesting that conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany be expedited, on its part addresses itself to the Government of the United States and also to the Governments of Great Britain and France with the proposal to urgently discuss the question of a peace treaty with Germany with a view to preparing in the nearest future an agreed draft

peace treaty and present it for examination by an appropriate international conference with the participation of all interested governments. It is understood that such a peace treaty must be worked out with the direct participation of Germany in the form of an all-German Government. From this it follows that the U.S.S.R., U.S.A., England, and France who are fulfilling control functions in Germany must also consider the question of conditions favoring the earliest formation of an all-German Government expressing the will of the German people.

With the aim of facilitating the preparation of a draft peace treaty the Soviet Government on its part proposes for the consideration of the Governments of the U.S.A., Great Britain and France the attached draft as a basis of a peace treaty with Germany.

In proposing consideration of this draft the Soviet Government at the same time expressed its readiness also to consider other possible proposals on this question.

The Government of the U.S.S.R. expects to receive the reply of the Government of the U.S.A. to the mentioned proposal at the earliest possible time.

Similar notes have also been sent by the Soviet Government to the Governments of Great Britain and France.

ENCLOSURE

Draft of Soviet Government of Peace Treaty with Germany

Almost seven years have passed since the end of the war with Germany but Germany still does not have a peace treaty, finds itself divided, continues to remain in an unequal situation as regards other governments. It is necessary to end such an abnormal situation. This responds to the aspirations of all peace loving peoples. It is impossible to assure a just status to the legal national interests of the German people without the earliest conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany.

Conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany has an important significance for the strengthening of peace in Europe. A peace treaty with Germany will permit final decision of questions which have arisen as a consequence of the second world war. The European states which have suffered from German aggression, particularly the neighbors of Germany, have a vital interest in the solution of these questions. Conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany will aid improvement of the international situation as a whole and at the same time aid the establishment of a lasting peace.

The necessity of hastening the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany is required by the fact that the danger of re-establishment of German militarism which has twice unleashed world wars has not been eliminated in as much as appropriate provisions of the Potsdam conference still remain unfulfilled. A peace treaty with Germany must guarantee elimination of the possibility of a rebirth of German militarism and German aggression.

Conclusion of the peace treaty with Germany will establish for the German people permanent conditions of peace, will aid the development of Germany as a unified democratic and peace-loving government in accordance with the Potsdam provisions and will assure to the German people the possibility of peaceful cooperation with other peoples.

As a result of this, the Governments of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Great Britain and France have decided urgently to set about working out a peace treaty with Germany.

The Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Great Britain and France consider that preparations of the peace treaty should be accomplished with the participation of Germany in the form of an all-German Government and that the peace treaty with Germany should be formed on the following basis:

Basis of peace treaty with Germany.

Participants.

Great Britain, the Soviet Union, the United States of America, France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland and other governments which participated with their armed forces in the war against Germany.

Political provisions.

(1) Germany is re-established as a unified state, thereby an end is put to the division of Germany and a unified Germany has a possibility of development as an independent democratic peace-loving state.

(2) All armed forces of the occupying powers must be withdrawn from Germany not later than one year from the date of entry into force of the peace treaty. Simultaneously all foreign military bases on the territory of Germany must be liquidated.

(3) Democratic rights must be guaranteed to the German people to the end that all persons under German jurisdiction without regard to race, sex, language or religion enjoy the rights of man and basic freedoms including freedom of speech, press, religious persuasion, political conviction and assembly.

(4) Free activity of democratic parties and organizations must be guaranteed in Germany with the right of freedom to decide their own internal affairs, to conduct meetings and assembly, to enjoy freedom of press and publication.

(5) The existence of organizations inimical to democracy and to the maintenance of peace must not be permitted on the territory of Germany.

(6) Civil and political rights equal to all other German citizens for participation in the building of peace-loving democratic Germany must be made available to all former members of the German army, including officers and generals, all former Nazis, excluding those who are serving court sentences for commission of crimes.

(7) Germany obligates itself not to enter into any kind of coalition or military alliance directed against any power which took part with its armed forces in the war against Germany.

Territory.

The territory of Germany is defined by the borders established by the provisions of the Potsdam Conference of the Great Powers.

Economic Provisions.

No kind of limitations are imposed on Germany as to development of its peaceful economy, which must contribute to the growth of the welfare of the German people.

Likewise, Germany will have no kind of limitation as regards trade with other countries, navigation and access to world markets.

Military Provisions.

(1) Germany will be permitted to have its own national armed forces (land, air, and sea) which are necessary for the defense of the country.

(2) Germany is permitted to produce war materials and equipment, the quantity and type of which must not exceed the limitations required for the armed forces established for Germany by the peace treaty.

Germany and the United Nations Organization.

The governments concluding a peace treaty with Germany will support the application of Germany for acceptance as a member of the United Nations Organization.

A Review of Political and Economic Conditions in France

by David K. E. Bruce¹

In spite of frequent Cabinet changes since the liberation, French foreign policy has remained remarkably constant. In fact during the last 7 years, there have been only two Foreign Ministers, Bidault and Schuman. By overwhelming majorities—even though the Communists have always voted in opposition—the French Parliament has approved all measures for the defense of the Western European community.

To implement this defense, the French Nation is currently making, in proportion to national income, the largest contribution of any NATO country except that of the United States, and prior to the outbreak of the Korean war the military effort of France was larger proportionately than our own.

Naturally, we have recently been deeply concerned over political developments in France. The interplay, the reaction between politics and economics is closely linked. There is an equal apprehension over the large, although reduced, Communist vote that expressed itself in the last general election.

Yet, these conditions should not be viewed with an excess of pessimism. It is quite evident that France could make a tremendous, and perhaps determining commitment to NATO defense if it were not for its involvement in Indochina, in that almost unknown war where French Union forces killed have now exceeded 30,000. This war at times seems a bottomless pit, for into it have been thrown the flower of the French professional army; almost 50 percent of the officers and non-commissioned officers so essential to the training and leadership of French NATO forces are engaged there, to say nothing of 25 percent of her naval contingents, as well as a most enterprising body of combat airmen.

As to communism in France, it no longer constitutes the threat that it once did to the integrity of the Atlantic community. With its parliamen-

tary representation reduced from 180 to 101 Assembly members, its newspapers circulating at less than half the momentum of a few years ago, its followers in the French Cgr Labor Union constituting only about 1/4 of their strength in 1946, its hold on the management of nationalized industries broken, its infiltration of the armed forces neutralized, its dominance in certain Government departments vitiated, its directors unable since 1948 to invoke a crippling strike, its demonstrations against Eisenhower and Adenauer public fiascos, its propaganda beginning to be effectively countered, its submission to orders from Moscow increasingly arousing the patriotic suspicions of French workmen and farmers, its influence has diminished to a point where, though still dangerous, it presents no immediate impediment to the realization of policies conceived in the national interest.

Unhappily, the burden of armament, and the operation of a fierce and costly anti-Communist war in Indochina, superimposed upon the necessary demands of an economy prostrated by years of enemy occupation, and only recently convalescent, have accentuated the inflationary forces in France, and rendered its balance-of-payments problem, especially in relation to the dollar zone, unmanageable without substantial foreign assistance.

Although an admirable proportion exists between agriculture and industry in France, any slight disturbance in it is provocative of unfavorable reactions. Last year there was, due to climatic conditions, a shortage in bread-grain production, and, as a consequence, large imports of wheat became mandatory. Although the output of coal in 1951 was the largest in French history, as was the performance per miner, the dislocation in the movement of that commodity and of coke, due primarily to the falling off of traditional imports from Great Britain and Germany, forced the French Government to have recourse to the uneconomic expenditure of dollars to import coal from the United States—and even so supplies were not sufficient to enable the steel industry to operate at more than 85 percent of capacity.

French industry has staged a noteworthy recovery since 1944, with the details of which you are

¹ Excerpts from a statement made before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in support of the Mutual Security Program for fiscal year 1953 on Mar. 25 and released to the press on the same date. Mr. Bruce was U.S. Ambassador to France from May 1949 until his appointment as Under Secretary. He assumed the latter position on Apr. 1.

thoroughly familiar. But the continuance of its pace depends upon its ability to import those raw materials in which it is notably deficient. Even within the broad confines of the French Union, little petroleum, rubber, cotton, nonferrous metals, and many other indispensable ingredients of modern industrial production have been found. Before the last war, these commodities were freely obtained through the use of the substantial foreign assets, in dollars and other hard currencies, of the Metropole.

These assets no longer exist. They were looted by a skilled and unscrupulous invader, and what little remained was devoted to the reconstruction of an exhausted plant and depleted inventories.

Under the impulse of Marshall Plan grants and loans it seemed for a time that a stable recovery was within sight.

But when the dislocations, inevitably consequent upon NATO defense preparations, were added to the serious drain in Indochina, coupled with a world-wide rise in the price of raw materials, and an adjustment on the part of France's trading partners to meet this unwelcome situation by restrictions in external commerce, began to have their full effect there was a deterioration in public finances, both internal and external, of the gravest description.

These were amongst the basic reasons for the evils which have afflicted the French economy. But, in my personal view, I must say that the instability of French politics, the inability to create those social conditions that would lessen party dissensions, the optimism and national pride that influenced the undertaking of military programs beyond the real capacity of the national economy to support, have aggravated a situation that was intrinsically extremely difficult.

Retrenchment in expenditures is the usual remedy for such unhealthy manifestations. Unfortunately this specific was impracticable of application. The French Government was resolved to continue the effort in Indochina and at the same time to supply a number of divisions to NATO in excess of those scheduled for any other member.

The result of this resolution confronts us with the present dilemma. In spite of the inequities in the incidence of French taxation, the amount of taxes actually collected in proportion to national income has been for some years the highest, with the exception of Great Britain, of any major country in the non-Communist West.

Moreover, when the report of the Temporary Council Committee of NATO fixed the politico-economic capacity of France to make a defense contribution in the amount of 1,190 billion francs, the French Government not only accepted this figure but, after careful deliberation, decided to increase it to 1,400 billion francs.

The only controversy that has arisen over this decision is as to how it should be financed, either by tightening credit on private industry in order

to increase Government borrowing, or by increasing already high and in some cases nearly confiscatory tax rates on ascertained incomes, or by making up the difference, by what may prove to be impracticable, through the collection of delinquent taxes.

There must also be taken into account the leadership in foreign policy displayed by successive French Governments in continental affairs. The initiation of the Schuman Plan for a pooling of the steel and coal resources of Western Europe, the proposal of the Pleven Plan for a European Defense Community, both of them leading toward the realization of that age old dream of civilized man—the formation of a political federation of Europe—are perhaps the most significant undertakings in the political field that our own, or, for that matter, many preceding generations have witnessed.

These developments have already proven so disturbing to the Soviet Government that it has endeavored in every fashion to counteract these great policies, devoted to peace, that are aimed to draw Germany into the Western orbit and to coordinate and strengthen the defense of the free world.

VOA Uses New Filter Device To Combat Soviet Jamming

Voice of America stations overseas are using a new electronic weapon to combat Soviet jamming, the Department of State announced on March 28.

The new device, known as a heterodyne filter, has proven effective in filtering out certain types of jamming and other interference. Used at overseas relay bases, the heterodyne filter has increased the percentage of Voice of America programs which can be relayed.

The filter eliminates or appreciably reduces interfering signals without seriously affecting the intelligibility of the program being relayed. Crystal filters previously in use reduced program intelligibility when filtering out interference.

Inexpensive and small in size, the heterodyne filter was developed by Voice engineers under the direction of Chief Engineer George Q. Herrick. In a recent test at one relay base, the filter proved effective against 52 percent of the interference encountered. The filter saved or improved program reception 60 percent of the time during another test.

Commenting on the new filter, Wilson Compton, Administrator of the International Information Administration which heads the Voice, said, "The filter is by no means an answer to the Soviet jamming problem, but it does represent another important forward step in our increasingly successful efforts to pierce the electronic curtain erected by the Kremlin."

How Can We Defend Free Culture?

by Howland H. Sargeant,
Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs¹

A little more than 100 days ago, Assistant Secretary Edward W. Barrett, speaking before another group of prominent Americans meeting in this city, revealed for the first time that the Soviets had mounted a gigantic cultural offensive aimed principally at the United States.²

What he described is now clearly phase one of an all-out cultural campaign. While at first the Soviets devoted their attention principally to the vodka circuit, coming out from behind the Iron Curtain only at the most propitious moments, they are now waging a major cultural offensive in many large and strategic areas of the world which have previously escaped saturation treatment.

Today, I want to report on phase two of the Soviet propaganda campaign in which culture is used as the cutting tool. As we trace their efforts, let us bear in mind that what they are presenting, for the most part, is not Russian culture—but a Sovietized perversion of it. This perversion for political ends first took place in the Soviet Union and then was extended to the satellites, where they have sought to eradicate the history and cultural heritages of whole countries. Now they are penetrating new areas with the Party's brand of culture.

Let us look at what they are doing in India, for example. Right now the Soviets are making an all-out effort in the field of painting at an art exhibit which held its grand opening at New Delhi earlier this month.

I have followed with a great deal of interest the despatches from our Embassy there; they add up to the blunt fact that the Soviets have seized upon the field of art as a major tool in their intensified propaganda campaign. Described as a multi-million dollar modern art collection, the large Soviet exhibition of paintings plus other objects of art is the first Soviet display of its kind ever held outside the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Indians are being "treated" to the works of some

¹ Address made before a Conference of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom at New York, N. Y., on Mar. 29 and released to the press on the same date.

² BULLETIN of Dec. 3, 1951, p. 903.

28 Stalin prize winning artists who have put on canvas the abundant life and peaceful intentions of the Soviet Union. They are seeing, for example, Geldberg's "Friends of Peace" which depicts Red soldiers feeding doves. They are being shown Nikioh's work which he calls "Election Canvassing," and Sorokin's masterpiece with the caption "Pepov Shows Admiral Makarov World's First Radio Set."

Now it is no mere accident that the Soviets have chosen South Asia, and more particularly India, as a priority target for their cultural offensive. India needs to develop itself and wants to live in peace. Most of its people want no part of what they mistakenly interpret as a struggle between two big powers. They do not recognize this struggle for what it is—a contest between freedom and totalitarianism, in which all free men have a stake. Some Indians fear that our build-up of military strength in defense of freedom might possibly be used for aggressive war—that we are warmongers. Others think that so-called decadent capitalism is materialistic, if not godless.

India, therefore, provides potentially fertile soil for planting the idea of Soviet interest in the arts. It is not difficult to understand why their major bid at the moment is through cultural infiltration. It is a bid which fits neatly into the pattern of their peace offensive. It is a bid which is being made with considerable mounting intensity. Let us examine what is taking place.

Methods of Cultural Infiltration in India

First of all, it would appear that the Communists are planning on increased use of motion pictures for propaganda, and the evidence shows that this medium has been assigned a high priority. Soviet film festivals have been held in Bombay and Calcutta; a three-man "Soviet Cine Art Delegation" was sent to India late in 1951; and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics sent the largest delegation of any country represented to the recent international film festival headed by its Deputy Minister of Cinematography, Semyonov. The large Soviet delegation might well have swamped U.S. participation had it not been for

the personal popularity of Frank Capra and the good fortune that a group of American actors were on location in India and were thus able to attend the festival.

In addition to the direct approach, the Communists, of course, form and use "front" groups in their cultural campaign. Thus we have the All-India Peace Council, the All-India Progressive Writers Association, the All-India Friends of the Soviet Union, the Indian People's Theatre Association, and the India-China Friendship Association. These organizations are not only useful to the Kremlin in direct infiltration of the culture of another country but serve in presenting the Communist line through indigenous channels. This indirect approach is apparent in the cultural exchanges between Red China and India.

Last fall, for example, an unofficial Indian cultural mission toured Communist China for 6 weeks and a similar mission of Chinese Communists visited India. This interchange provided Indians with a rosy view of Communist achievements in China and emphasized the cultural ties between the two countries. The Indian delegation of 15 was invited by five prominent organizations in China to participate in the second anniversary celebrations of the People's Republic of China at Peiping on October 1.

Host organizations were the China Peace Committee, the All-China Federation of Labor, the All-China Federation of Democratic Women, the All-China Association of Writers and Artists, and the New Democratic Youth League. In China the good will mission visited villages, factories, universities, and schools in Peiping, Tientsin, Nanking, Shanghai, Canton, and Mukden.

Judging from their statements made in China and on their return to India, they were impressed with the "spectacle of a great and ancient country in the process of a glorious rebirth," with the devotion of the new government and government leaders to the cause of the people, with progress in national reconstruction after only 2 years, with the "liberation" of more than 300 million Chinese peasants from centuries-old serfdom, with the new marriage law insuring freedom and equality to the women of China, with the enthusiastic support of the Chinese for the new regime. Upon returning to India, members of the delegation made a number of speeches recounting their findings, but they pointedly ignored China's close ties with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

A primary element of this indirect or indigenous approach on the part of the Kremlin is the playing down of political connotations. It is therefore less irritating, far more subtle in effect, and potentially far more dangerous and difficult to cope with. The Soviets are making increased use of this technique in their current cultural offensive.

An all-out Communist cultural drive, reaching

down to provincial levels and making use of In-All-India Peace Council, the All-India Progressive Writers Association, the All-India Cultural Conference and Festival for Peace to be held in Calcutta, April 2 to 6. The plans, as described in *Crossroads*, organ of the Communist Party of India, furnish the most clear-cut blueprint so far available for involving in the Soviet "peace" offensive a broadly representative group and all aspects of Indian culture.

The program calls for the organization of provincial committees representing workers, artists, and cultural organizations "of various shades of opinion and of different schools" in preparation for the conference. These committees are to prepare exhaustive papers on all phases of Indian culture.

Since the All-India Peace Council, sponsor of the conference, is organized at district and even subdistrict levels, Communist cultural activities probably will be extended to these levels on a more highly organized basis as a result of the conference. The conference itself may be expected to produce a new plan for linking all cultural activities being carried on by various front organizations and individuals. It may possibly create a new cultural organization in line with World Peace Council directives of February and November 1951.

Their objectives are seen in the papers the Preparatory Committee has asked the provincial committees to prepare. I quote:

Culture in the Service of Peace: a review of the contribution to peace made by literature, art, films, dance, and music.

War Propaganda: a memorandum on the war propaganda carried on through films and literature, and its effect on the people and on education.

Peace and the Working Conditions of Cultural Workers: the effect of the rising cost of living as the result of war and war tension on cultural workers and cultural work; effects of high cost of paper on printing and literature; effects of non-availability of raw film and equipment on the film industry.

Imperialist Stranglehold Over People's Culture: how imperialism and its need for war has affected Indian culture.

Cultural Exchanges: how British imperialists have sought to cut off India from contact with the cultural achievements of other countries.

These are some of the highlights of the current phase of the Soviet cultural offensive as they have unfolded in one large and strategic area—India.

Moscow's Voice in Japan and Canada

One might logically inquire: Is the U.S.S.R. shifting its focus from Europe to Asia? The answer is "no." What the Kremlin commenced on a limited scale a year or more ago in the satellite countries and extended in sporadic cultural

activities in Europe was the first phase of a greatly intensified effort which is now unfolding—a saturation effort in large and strategic areas.

The intensified Soviet cultural offensive now being directed at India and other areas may next be turned on Japan and Southeast Asia. In fact, the suspicion that Japan has been earmarked for a Soviet cultural offensive is already proving correct, when only last month it came to light that the Soviet Union had placed orders for 40,000 Japanese matrices.

A survey this month among book dealers reveals that Soviet-published books in Japanese are “flooding the market . . . brand new books are being sold in second-hand stores as ‘clearance items’ at one-third the list price . . . they are selling like hot cakes. The dealers report that they hardly have time to keep them on the shelves.”

Until this year, Soviet-printed Japanese books were obtainable “at very low prices at the Soviet Mission reading room.” But the reading-room users were mostly the “intelligentsia,” so the circulation of the books was not wide. In January the Mission stopped selling. At the same time, “vast numbers of Soviet books began to appear at the old book stores in Tokyo’s Kanda district.” The current bestsellers among them are *History of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union* and *Selected Works of Lenin*. The demand is increasing for *Brief History of Stalin and Nation and Revolution*.

At present, the Soviet cultural offensive in Japan is limited chiefly to a book program, and this situation probably will continue until the diplomatic status of the Soviets in post-treaty Japan is certain. Moscow did manage recently, however, to bestow the Stalin Peace Prize on Ikuo Oyama, left-wing peace-front organizer and a person of some prestige.

Finally, if one takes some measure of comfort in the fiction that the Soviet cultural drive is an ocean away, he should be interested in reports emanating from just across the international border nearest us. Perhaps you saw the banner headline in a recent issue of the *Financial Post*, published in Toronto, Canada—“Culture: The New Smoke Screen for Canadian Reds”—(Jan. 19, 1952).

The six-column story under this banner cites dozens of examples of Moscow-mesmerized cultural activities and concludes:

The Communists have failed dismally to peddle their “peace” line to labor . . . now they are out to try to capture the people who consider themselves “intellectuals”—the teachers, scientists, clergy, musicians, composers, writers, actors, and art and music lovers.

At a Party conference in Toronto, the *Post* quotes leader Tim Buck as announcing:

Our party, locally and nationally, is going to extend its activities on the cultural front . . . the Labor Progressive Party must seek to encourage every activity and every trend toward the development of a People’s culture.

Again, the voice of Moscow—this time being mouthed by people a hemisphere removed.

Vulnerability of the Campaign

It’s always difficult to measure the relative success of attempts to influence men’s minds, but I do think in all honesty we can place some sort of evaluation on the Soviet cultural offensive as a major tool of their propaganda machine. I would tend to believe, also, that any such appraisal, piecemeal though it may be, should seek to give some indication of why they succeeded or why they failed.

Now what has been the story of their success when they rolled their cultural vehicle onto the open highway? Have they been able to maintain their line of Soviet superiority with the same 100 percent consistency?

Phase two of the Soviet cultural offensive shows clearly that while they have had their successes, they have also had their failures. This is true in India and it is equally true elsewhere.

There is no doubt, for example, that the several lavish exhibitions to which I referred earlier have had their effect on the Indian populace, particularly in bolstering the activities of the pro-Communist groups. The recent Chinese cultural mission to India, for instance, was well received by Indians. The reason, perhaps, is that the educated Indian public has a genuine curiosity about China and very little opportunity to satisfy it. For this reason it may be that the exhibit of Chinese photographs and art objects may have been successful. Probably for this reason also many people went to the meetings and listened attentively. This desire for information resulted in their activities receiving wide press coverage.

Despite the success of this event and others, there are definite signs that the intense campaign of the Soviets does not always meet with favor but at times actually backfires.

For example, at the International Industries Fair in Bombay the Soviets outdid themselves. In a spurt of cultural zeal they created what to many observers appeared to be a typical square in any Soviet city. Six huge red hammer and sickle flags shouted their cultural implication in contrast to the rather inconspicuous Indian national flag. It is reported to have drawn bitter comment from exasperated patriotic citizens and the Bombay Government subsequently refused to permit an extension of the fair on the grounds that it was being exploited by Communists for propaganda purposes.

Another bug dropped in the Soviet’s cultural ointment when the Communists complained that leaflets “blackguarding the People’s China” were distributed in front of the Chinese pavilion. To this the Bombay *National Standard* replied in part:

India is still a democracy, and no suggestions of a ban on nonviolent expression of opinion should be tolerated. If anti-Communist propaganda in front of the Fair is to be deterred officially, because the Russians and the Chinese are participating, the Indian Government may be asked by Mr. Truman with greater justification to suppress anti-American sentiments which the Russians and

the Chinese are inciting all the time, because America has given us economic aid and promises more.

The paper concluded, "The Russians and the Chinese are here not to help us, but (to help) themselves."

Official translators are supposed to interpret accurately but when N.S. Krishnan, famous south Indian comedian, toured Russia for 3 weeks he found that translators in the Soviet Union interpret the way the Kremlin wants them to.

During a dinner in Moscow he declared "Gandhi-ism and communism are equally great modern ideologies but . . . Gandhi's revolution was nonviolent while the Russian revolution was not peaceful."

The Russian interpreter refused to translate the sentences and created a scene saying he was sure that Gandhi-ism was not as great as communism.

The Soviet art exhibit now going on in India is meeting with a dull thud from the Bombay press. No favorable press comment has greeted the efforts of Moscow's politically minded artists. On the contrary, critical "debunking" articles are greeting their efforts. Such headlines as "Kremlin Attempt at Seduction" calls attention to the numerous Communist cultural raids on India since 1948, including the present exhibit.

Now we must not lay too much emphasis on these indications of the vulnerability of the Soviet cultural offensive. Although there are plainly evident some indications of weakness, we know that in this field as well as in the direct business of informing, the Communist propagandists are by no means weaklings. However, we have learned that the Communist propaganda techniques are vulnerable because they are founded upon "the big lie." We also have seen again and again that Communist propagandists bungle and make bad blunders. In the long run, the difference between words and deeds, between promises and performances, becomes evident to the very people the Kremlin propagandists are trying to beguile.

The Communist degradation of culture for political purposes exposes a comparable fundamental weakness. The more they come out into the open, the more they demonstrate this fact—the more they sharpen the focus on their fraud.

Coupled with their efforts to be best rather than honest in cultural interchange, the Soviets find it compelling to tear down and destroy, by all means at their command, the idea that any laudable culture can exist in Western civilization and particularly in the United States.

A rather striking example is found in a recent edition of a French magazine of Communist sponsorship. Here are pictures of spaghetti swooshing queens, of slums, of wrestlers in the mud, of jitterbugging, of the American cinema filled with degradation and violence, of our comic strips which have enriched the American language and culture with expressions such as: "crack, paf, honk, zok, bop, bang, wham."

It is all summed up neatly in the March 21 edition of the *Cominform Journal*, which concludes a piece titled: "Flowering of Science and Culture in the U.S.S.R." in these words:

As for the corrupt "culture" of imperialism, it mutilates man, depraves his mind, implants among people misanthropy, moral dissoluteness, appeals to the lowest instincts, cultivates criminal tendencies. . . . For this reason advanced and progressive people in all countries reject with disgust and hatred this "culture" of capitalism that is rotting alive.

The U.S. Response

What then should be the response of the United States to this vigorous prostitution of culture for Soviet political ends?

Not, surely, to scream "Anything you can do, I can do better!" Communists *have* to believe that every human activity is inexorably determined by the economic structure from which it grows. Thus they are under an endless compulsion to be first in everything in order to demonstrate the perfection of the Soviet paradise. Their athletic teams must win, even if they have to change the rules. Their inventors must have discovered everything, even if they have to change history. Their scientists *have* to be right, even if they have to change nature. Their musicians and artists and dancers must *always* be the best, or they won't play at all.³

Communists also *have* to believe that all human endeavor is to be chained to the support of their slave order. Science, art, literature, music can have no free ends of their own. The death-laden fog of Politburo domination has entered area after area of Russian scientific and cultural life, reducing to a grotesque and frightening puppetry the once-rich welling of genius from that brilliant and gifted people. After Pavlov Lysenko, after a Moussorgsky or Tchaikovsky, the stultification of a talented Shostakovich; after Tolstoi and Dostoyevsky and Turgenev, the strident whine of the propaganda novelists; after the rich, moving and symbolic religious art of Orthodox Russia, the wooden posturing of Soviet art. Only in those few areas in which apparent political unimportance has allowed chinks of freedom—such as ballet and musical performance, as opposed to composition—has the innate Russian creative genius been able to remain alive.

In the free world it is not so. Cultural vitality, we believe, grows only from the interaction of two elements. One is the free exploration of the sensitive, individual human spirit seeking clearer and more moving forms of expression. The other is the common fund of human experience and destiny which such creative spirits seek to express and the

³ For a series of articles on Soviet thought control as applied to the educational system, to science and scholarship, and to cultural activities, see BULLETIN of Nov. 5, 1951, p. 719, Nov. 26, 1951, p. 844, and Dec. 3, 1951, p. 895, respectively.

common heritage of cultural symbols and values that gives universal meaning to their work. This free and uncompelled union of the individual and the common heritage is, in our view, the essence of cultural life. It is what makes possible the contribution of the gifted creator to the common fund of human experience and aspiration everywhere; it is what makes it possible in turn for the individual everywhere to be enriched by sharing universal cultural insights.

And I think it is precisely toward the excellencies that may be peculiar to American culture that attention needs to be drawn. It is toward the common heritage that is shared and toward the common human experience which our culture and others alike express. We need to send abroad the very best that we have in literature, in art, in music, in the dance and in drama, not that we may boast its excellence but in order that we may show as clearly as we can the fullness and intensity with which we share a common human cultural heritage.

The great problems of human existence are, after all, common to all men. The deepest aspirations of the human spirit are the same everywhere. Birth and death, hunger and work, peace and freedom, brotherhood and love, are common to all men. Through this unity of human fears and needs and hopes can be communicated in its moving fullness and immediacy, the creative outpourings of free minds and spirits. Only through freely creative and freely shared cultural expression, we believe, can every people see its own values, its own fundamental humanity, mirrored in its neighbor. Only through such cultural expression can they arrive at that sense of identity and common purpose that must underlie all efforts at common political and economic action.

When these objectives are clearly understood by others to be our only objectives in presenting abroad examples of our cultural life in America, then the reasons for American participation in art exhibits, film festivals, and theatrical performances become evident. Then an American film becomes not an ideological weapon aimed at cultural penetration, but simply a vehicle for conveying the artistic intentions of a free and peaceful people. The performance of a theatrical troupe becomes not an appeal for a political ideology but simply entertainment put on for the enjoyment of an audience. An exhibition of paintings becomes not a strained and dull attempt to show the excellence of a political system but the honest efforts of artists to paint pictures which will create honest impressions.

Cultural Interchange Based on the Sharing Principle

That is why we believe that no effort we can make in this field can have a deeper or more lasting meaning than to throw open the doors for the fullest and freest sharing of cultural experience between ourselves and other peoples.

I hope you will forgive me if I have seemed excessively idealistic for a practical Government officer. I believe, however, that it is literally true that the kind of world-in-the-making to which the foreign policy of this country seeks to contribute can come into being only on the basis of a conviction of fundamental human unity underlying all our national differences—a conviction in turn that can arise only in the free sharing of the individual and national expressions of a universal cultural heritage.

It is my own personal experience over the period of the last 5 years in working with the programs of International Information and Educational Exchange that this is the basic conviction which we must have if these programs are to be successful.

At the present time, under the able direction of Wilson Compton, your Government has a program designed to give momentum to this cultural interchange between the United States and other countries of the world, based on this principle of sharing.

As a result of the close cooperation between our Government and private citizens and organizations, peoples abroad in the past have seen such examples of our national culture as the highly successful tour of Scandinavia by the Howard University players and the 4-month European tour of the American National Ballet Theatre. The outstanding performances of such groups as the Hall Johnson Choir and the Juilliard String Quartet, Judith Anderson's *Medea*, Astrid Varnay's *Isolde*, and the colorful show *Oklahoma* at the Berlin Cultural Festival were the results of the cooperation of your Government and private groups.

Right now, as you know, we are working with the American Committee for Cultural Freedom to arrange appearances of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, the New York City Ballet, and Virgil Thompson's opera *Four Saints in Three Acts* at the Paris Festival this spring. Not only will these American cultural achievements be seen by Parisian audiences but arrangements have recently been made for the New York City Ballet to appear in six other European countries, participating in festivals in Switzerland, Amsterdam, Florence, and Edinburgh.

Likewise, the Boston Symphony will tour other European cities. Plans are also under way between the Department and the American National Theatre and Academy to send a company to play Gershwin's opera *Porgy and Bess* in Great Britain this fall and to tour the continent early in 1953.

Another example of how your Government and private initiative work together in the cultural field are the exchanges of young musicians now being undertaken by the National Music League and the French organization *Jeunesse Musicale*. As a result, young violinists and pianists of prom-

ise from both nations are giving concerts in each other's countries.

Special collections of books including works in the field of the arts, literature, and the social and physical sciences have been and are being sent to many parts of the world.

This year, with funds from a private donor and with the aid of the American Government, an exhibit of American art is being organized by the American Federation of Arts, under the direction of David Finley of the National Gallery, to be exhibited as part of American participation at the summer-long Venice Biennale in Italy.

These are but a few of the international cultural projects we Americans have undertaken or plan to undertake. In all of them you find one priceless factor—the initiative of the private individual with a desire to create and to share. He is not directed to do so by his Government. His creation is not one of decree, it is one of desire. It is not a fraudulent attempt to win plaudits, it is an honest attempt to express his innermost ideas and feelings and to share these satisfactions with his fellow man. These are the elements of free culture.

I believe that you of the American Committee and all American artists, scientists, and musicians bear a transcending responsibility to yourselves, to America, and to free peoples everywhere to defend our free culture through the wisest and widest possible sharing of that culture.

The Communist Conference In Defense of Children

[Released to the press March 28]

The Department of State has received a number of inquiries from American citizens concerning the so-called "International Conference in Defense of Children" which now is scheduled to convene at Vienna, Austria, during the period April 12 to 16, 1952. Since it is apparent that the writers of these inquiries are unaware of the true nature of this meeting, their attention has been drawn to the Department's announcement of November 29, 1951, on this subject.¹

The Department at that time explained that this "conference" was planned, is being organized, and will be run by the Communist-dominated "World Federation of Democratic Women" with the active collaboration of the Cominform-run "World Federation of Trade Unions."

This latter body, the Department pointed out, was ejected from its headquarters at Paris by the French Government last year and immediately migrated to Vienna where it maintains its headquarters in a Soviet-requisitioned building. On October 11, 1951, the Austrian Government pub-

¹ BULLETIN of Dec. 10, 1951, p. 935.

licly announced that the organization was in Vienna at no one's invitation and had repeatedly refused to comply with Austrian law.

It is fair to assume, the Department pointed out, that this "conference" is another device in the campaign to recruit unsuspecting and well-meaning people for the cynically hypocritical Communist "Peace Movement."

Hungary Nationalizes Real Estate

[Released to the press March 24]

The following is released as of interest to American owners of houses, apartments, stores, factories, and warehouses in Hungary.

The Department has now received the text of the Hungarian Nationalization Decree, dated February 17, 1952, affecting such property, together with the texts of other pertinent laws and regulations.

The American Legation at Budapest informed the Hungarian Government on February 19, 1952, that it reserves the right to make subsequent representations on behalf of any American citizen whose property may be affected by the decree.

Persons in the United States who have not been notified by their caretakers or agents in Hungary about the decree and the possibility of appeal from the act of nationalization on or before May 3, 1952, may obtain copies of the translation by writing to the Division of Protective Services, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

New Cuban Government Recognized

[Released to the press March 27]

The U.S. Ambassador at Habana on March 27 informed the Minister of State of Cuba of the recognition by the U.S. Government of the new Government of Cuba.

Current Legislation on Foreign Policy

Defense Production Act. Progress Report—No. 14.

World Supply, United States Production, Consumption, Imports and Exports of Steel, Copper and Aluminum, and Domestic Requirements and Allocations by the Joint Committee on Defense Production. S. Rept. 1310, 82d Cong., 2d sess. 34 pp.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens. H. Rept. 1539, 82d Cong., 2d sess. [To accompany S. Con. Res. 58] 2 pp.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens. H. Rept. 1540, 82d Cong., 2d sess. [To accompany S. Con. Res. 63] 2 pp.

A Common Responsibility for Achieving Health Security

by Willard L. Thorp
*Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs*¹

Today, about one-fifth of the world's population lives in economically developed areas where mortality rates are relatively low and health and sanitation conditions relatively advanced. These are the areas of greatest economic productivity and tend to be in the vanguard of economic and social progress. About another one-fifth of the world's population lives in areas fairly well advanced in the application of modern technology. About three-fifths of the world's population lives in technologically backward countries. Here the standard of living is miserably low, and bad health conditions are a major factor in this tragic situation. The cost of preventable disease, which is largely responsible for low health status in underdeveloped areas, represents a colossal burden. In the Philippines in a recent year, for example, in a total population of 20 million people there were 2 million victims of malaria, with 10,000 annual deaths, and 1,300,000 ill from tuberculosis with 35,000 annual deaths. Here is a tremendous economic loss from these two diseases alone.

The cost of premature death is also tremendous in these underdeveloped areas. In them, a much smaller proportion of healthy adults must support a much larger percentage of unproductive children and disabled grown-ups. For example, in various countries of Southeast Asia and the Middle East, only about one-half the children born reach the age of 15 and only 15 percent live to the age of 60. By contrast, in the United States, 90 percent become adults and two-thirds are still alive at 60. In the underdeveloped areas, the chain reactions are all clearly in evidence—poor health, low productivity, illiteracy, and poverty. All are holding back economic and social progress.

Let me give an example. In the fertile Terai district in India, malaria had become so serious that an area which had once sustained 350,000 population had been reduced to one-fifth that number. After only 3 years of malaria control in the Terai and neighboring areas, the population had increased by over 100,000, the agricultural area

under cultivation had been increased by 35,000 acres, and grain production increased by 35 percent. In relation to a country as highly populated as India, experts have debated whether public-health programs and efforts to reduce mortality do not accentuate economic and social problems. However, health programs such as this extend the working life of the population and the span of time during which they can serve as efficient producers. A healthy, productive farmer is always better than a sick one, and increased health contributed to increased food supply.

In 1951 the Iranian Ministry of Public Health started a campaign against malaria in an infected area near the Caspian Sea where 2½ million people live. Two hundred and twenty-four tons of DDT shipped from the United States as part of our Point Four Program reached Iran in time last May to spray half a million dwellings. Already the incidence of the disease has been cut from 88 percent to 35 percent—and 2 more years of anti-malaria warfare will, experts believe, completely wipe out malaria and greatly improve general health conditions as well as increase productivity.

Throughout the underdeveloped areas in Africa, the Near and Middle East, and South Asia, I think it would be fair to say that up to 90 percent of the rural population is sick much of the time or only half well. When limited human energies are concentrated on the day-to-day struggle for survival the possibilities of economic and social progress and democratic growth are almost nil.

It is clear that sickness, poverty, and lack of education form a vicious circle and the loss in economic terms alone resulting from these conditions is incalculable. Up until recent years the possibility of breaking this vicious circle seemed dim. Remedies for the control of preventable disease when they were available were beyond the financial means of poor countries. The peoples in these nations lived in a hopeless state of misery.

Controlling Debilitating Diseases

Recent discoveries in preventive medicine such as the antibiotics and powerful new insecticides

¹ Excerpts from an address made before the National Health Council at New York, N. Y., on Mar. 13 and released to the press on the same date.

have made it possible to control several of the most debilitating diseases at very low cost. For example, with the availability of DDT in India the cost of malaria control has been reduced to 12 cents per capita. This miraculous change from disease to health costs only the price of one bus ride in New York City.

It is easy enough to talk about the problem of health throughout the world, but the important question is what is being done and what should be done about improving health conditions. We do have a tremendous interest and concern about these other less fortunate countries. We have a humanitarian interest, but we also have a social, an economic, and a political interest. In much of the world today, economic development and political stability are interdependent. And, I need not remind you, the world today is 142 hours around.

Doing something helpful about health conditions in other countries is not a new experience for us. Up until a decade ago, nearly all of our contributions to world health have been made by private organizations and institutions, and their rich experience has contributed greatly to the developing program of international collaboration in health. For many years, remarkable work has been done under difficult conditions in many of the most needy countries by medical missionaries, and by missions for relief and reconstruction such as those sent by various religious groups. This people-to-people form of service has helped not alone to improve health conditions but to exemplify the great concept of brotherhood which has been the motivating force back of the individuals who went abroad, and the widespread support given them by millions of Americans.

As another illustration of private activity, since 1913 the Rockefeller Foundation has been pioneering in an outstanding way in the international health field. It has sponsored public-health demonstrations throughout the world. It has granted fellowships, organized institutes, carried on research, provided the knowledge and experience which has made far more productive the work of governments, including our own, and the World Health Organization. Without this pioneering, we would probably be at the experimental stage of demonstrations instead of actually improving the health of millions of people. Other organizations such as the Kellogg Foundation have followed in this path, notably with fellowships.

The work of the private agencies goes back many years. Today, our Government is also actively participating in the effort to improve health conditions in other countries. For over a decade the United States has been cooperating with the other American Republics through the Institute of Inter-American Affairs in a broad variety of cooperative health programs. The Institute is now the operating arm of our Point Four

Program in Latin America. This hemispheric program has had four chief points of emphasis: (1) the development of local health services through health centers; (2) sanitation of the environment with particular emphasis on water supply, sewage disposal, and insect control; (3) training and full-time employment of professional public health workers; and (4) education of the public in health matters. It has concentrated on complete community-health development with full-time trained direction and active community participation. Over 1,300 professionals from Latin America in the health field have been given advanced training in the United States in public health. Some 240 local training courses have already been given at subprofessional levels. Some 2,820 distinct projects have been undertaken jointly with the health ministries of these countries since 1942. They have included the construction and operation of health centers; building and administration of hospitals; construction of water supply systems, sewage systems, and other health facilities such as nursing schools, laboratories, markets, and public laundries. Out of this program improved public health has achieved the status of a national movement in many of the Latin American countries. The experience and knowledge gained there are of immeasurable value in health programs developing elsewhere in the world.

World Health Programs

Today the United States is carrying on programs not only in our own hemisphere, but in many other parts of the world—in Near Eastern countries and in Pacific islands, in northern Africa and in southern Asia. Various phases of these programs have had different bases—relief, rehabilitation, reconstruction of war-devastated areas, development of strategic resources, containment of communism, and long-range social and economic development. Whatever the initial reason for them, all of these programs have been designed to build toward a future secured by stronger national and local health services in the countries concerned. Each has had, or is making, a major contribution to building up a permanent world-wide health structure.

Any review of world health problems and progress would be incomplete without paying tribute to the role of the World Health Organization (WHO) whose 79 member nations are dedicated to the attainment by all peoples of the highest possible level of health. Our participation in the World Health Organization represents our conviction that health security can effectively be achieved through international pooling of knowledge and skills under international direction. We shall all have an opportunity on World Health Day, April 7, to honor the WHO objective—"the attainment by all peoples of the highest possible level of health."

The **Who** during 1951 expended about 10 million dollars on its world-wide program, including 3.5 million dollars beyond its regular budget supplied by the Technical Assistance Program of the United Nations.

The sharing of knowledge, the training programs and fellowships, and the field operations of **Who** are vital and effective weapons mobilizing a broad range of resources for a concerted attack on disease. During the past year the World Health Assembly adopted the International Sanitary Regulations which establish a single uniform health code in the world for all forms of international travel and trade. The **Who** also issued the International Pharmacopoeia which sets uniform standards of strength and purity for a large number of drugs. Vitally important also is the **Who's** role in the exchange of publications and information. Most important of all, of course, is its work directly with the many member governments, in aiding and encouraging them to move forward with public health and similar programs.

The various governments and the **Who** are important instruments, but they are only instruments. They can be effective only by means of individuals. That is where you and the organizations you represent come so importantly into the picture. Certainly, a role of major importance must be played by the international professional societies, and their national affiliates. Some of these bodies as you know cover a whole profession, such as the World Medical Association, the International Council of Nurses, and the International Dental Association. Others deal with specific diseases—such as the International Union Against Cancer, the International Leprosy Association, and the International Union Against Venereal Diseases. Still others deal with problems reflected in their names—the International Union for Child Welfare, the World Federation for Mental Health, the International Hospital Federation, and the International Association for the Prevention of Blindness. A special position is held by the League of Red Cross Societies which was formed right after World War I to mobilize Red Cross societies to promote public health education to give popular support to public health work.

All these and a number of other associations have been admitted into formal relationship with the World Health Organization. But international nongovernmental organizations are still lacking in important fields such as those of malaria and other tropical diseases, environmental health, and sanitary engineering.

Role of Private Organizations

The private organizations can make significant and invaluable contributions to the world health program. The basic requirement is that they reduce their sensitivity to geographical boundary lines, and think of their problems in international

terms. Other countries share the same problems, often in a much more serious form. Individuals in other countries are working as you are to try to record progress. There is here a tremendous opportunity to give sympathy, encouragement, and help.

There are certain things which organizations as organizations can do. They can contribute to the planning and operation of the World Health Organization through their consultative arrangements. Furthermore, we are anxious to see coordinating committees in each country which will help to assure that there will be one integrated health program and not many local projects independently sponsored by various international agencies. If outside help is to have its full effect, it must not only aim at strengthening the national health service of the country but must also receive the full support of the medical and allied professions. This can only be assured if the professional organizations are willing to sit on the coordinating committee and share the responsibilities.

There are three fundamental types of contribution which organizations can make. First is in the field of professional knowledge—to continue to seek solutions to the problems not yet solved. Second, they can actively help in the transmission of our knowledge and experience to the other less fortunate countries. Not only is their help tremendously important in providing training and hospitality to the doctors, nurses, and other health workers visiting this country, but they and their colleagues as they travel abroad for professional or personal purposes can share their store of wisdom and experience with their conferees in other parts of the world.

Third, from the ranks of private organizations will come many of the skilled people who are needed in the world health program. For many of them, this may mean a substantial personal sacrifice. I hope that ways and means will be found to encourage them, particularly to provide professional assurances that these men and women going abroad will not be handicapped professionally because of their contributions to public health service. Moreover, they will be going, many of them, to face primitive conditions where human ingenuity must often substitute for modern equipment, and where the capacity to adjust to different languages, modes of thought, and traditions is as important as the technical knowledge they bring to their work. Organizations can assist them by keeping them in touch with professional thoughts and ideas as they develop and even in appropriate cases by contributions of needed equipment and materials.

Encouraging and Training Personnel

Looking at the picture in the longer run, we must find ways and means to encourage and to train personnel who are equipped for and capable

of undertaking health assignments for brief or long duration outside this country. Lack of trained personnel is the most serious bottleneck slowing up the world health campaign. Even here in the United States there is a serious shortage of public-health workers. At present 19 percent of the budgeted positions for physicians in state and local health services are vacant for want of qualified personnel; for sanitary engineers there is a similar 15 percent vacancy rate; and for graduate nurses 8 percent.

Our needs, serious as they are, look small compared to those in underdeveloped countries. While in the United States we have one physician for a little over 700 inhabitants, most Latin American countries have from 2,000 to 10,000 inhabitants per physician; Indonesia has about 80,000 inhabitants per physician. In most of these countries the shortage of trained nurses is even more serious. Iran, for example, has around 900 trained nurses in a population of 17 million, and Brazil has about 1,300 trained nurses in a nation of 52 million.

Despite these grave needs, the job must be and is being tackled with vigor and enthusiasm. New and more economical forms of treatment, more facilities, professional and subprofessional training programs, educational efforts—these are all helping to liquidate some of the infectious diseases. But despite the fantastic miracles in controlling and eradicating yaws, malaria, and the other plagues, tough and demanding work lies ahead. It is much easier to dust with DDT than it is to establish sanitary practices, and there are many parasites and diseases which still challenge our knowledge and our skill.

It is to be hoped that as the world campaign for public health develops, governments and private organizations together will be able to produce a real grassroot movement. A report on a Near Eastern project read as follows: "Personal hygiene was one of the first subjects in the new school and after a few days of seeing their boys and girls go in for washing their hands, faces and hair, the parents also began to adopt this new approach to health." The knowledge spread through these programs is almost as infectious as the diseases they are trying to control.

The possibility for building real international good will depends fundamentally upon what people do. The chance contact with people from another country—the comments made, the attitudes taken, the interest or lack of interest, the personal spirit—the establishment of a common enterprise—all these are things which count. One of the most effective instruments in the process of building physical, and mental and spiritual health is the sense of sharing, of cooperation, of common responsibility which has no geographical barriers.

Export-Import Bank Grants Housing Credit to Ecuador

The Export-Import Bank announced on March 25 approval of a credit of \$800,000 to the Republic of Ecuador to assist in housing reconstruction in the areas of Ecuador devastated by the earthquake of August 5, 1949.

The Government of Ecuador, with technical and financial assistance provided by the Pan-American Union, has made geological studies, which serve as the basis for the location of the various housing projects under which more than 4,500 single-family houses are to be built. The Government, with the assistance of U.S. technicians, also has adopted a building code providing for certain minimum standards of earthquake-resistant construction. The houses to be financed under this credit will comply with these standards.

The credit will be used to finance the purchase and transportation to Ecuador of U.S. equipment, materials, and supplies required for Ecuador's housing program in the Provinces of Tungurahua, Cotopaxi, and Chimborazo.

The local costs of materials and erection will be obtained in part from donations made to Ecuador by various governments, organizations, and individuals shortly after the earthquake and, in part, from the yield of special taxes, the revenue of which is distributed to the Reconstruction and Planning Boards of the three provinces. The U.S. Institute of Inter-American Affairs responsible for Point Four operations in Latin America has been requested by the Ecuadoran Government to assist in supervising the housing construction program. It is planned by the Ecuadoran Government that the completed houses will be sold to victims of the earthquake by the Reconstruction and Planning Boards on a 20-year purchase plan without down payment.

The credit will be repayable in quarterly installments over a 20-year period. Interest will be paid at the rate of 3½ percent per annum.

Filing Date Extended for Claims Under U.S., Panama Convention

[Released to the press March 26]

Josiah Marvel, Jr., chairman of the International Claims Commission of the United States, announced on March 26 that the Commission has extended the deadline date for filing claims under the United States-Panama Claims Convention of 1950, from February 29, 1952, to June 2, 1952. The Commission found it necessary to extend this deadline date for the reason that only a small percentage of persons entitled to share in a \$400,000 settlement fund have filed claims.

It appears from the old files of the State Department turned over to the Commission that there are approximately 300 potential claimants against the fund, but the Commission has been able to locate less than 100 of these. Notices to the others have been returned as undeliverable by the Post Office Department.

These claims have been outstanding since 1931 and arise from a decision of the Supreme Court of Justice of Panama on October 20, 1931, whereby certain lands called El Encanto, which certain U.S. citizens alleged they had acquired in good faith, were declared to be the property of Panama. These lands were originally purchased by American citizens during 1913-15 and were resold among small purchasers in the United States from 1915 to 1923. These small purchasers apparently were induced to make investments upon the representation by the land promoters that the lands were valuable for agricultural, timber, and cattle-raising purposes. However, no development ever followed. Most of the original purchasers resided in northern California, with some in Utah, Arizona, and surrounding States.

Many of the original purchasers of the lands have since died but their legal representatives are entitled to file claims against the \$400,000 fund. In many cases the only addresses on file with the Commission are those given by the original owners of the land to the State Department over 20 years ago.

Under the terms of the Claims Convention with Panama, any amount which remains undistributed from the \$400,000 fund, less expenses of adjudication, will be returned to the Government of the Republic of Panama.

Persons who feel that they may qualify for an award under the Panama Claims Agreement should communicate with the International Claims Commission, U.S. Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

Facilities for International Motor Touring

[Released to the press March 25]

The Road Traffic Convention of 1949, a world treaty designed to facilitate and encourage international motor touring, came into force on March 25 in the United States and several other countries. United States motorists taking their cars abroad for travel purposes will benefit by liberal provisions on recognition of their home driving licenses and automobile registration. Similar facilities will be extended to foreign motorists traveling in the United States.

The Convention was declared in force by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, follow-

ing ratification by the requisite number of nations. The United States, France, Czechoslovakia, Monaco, and Sweden have ratified to date. The provisions of the treaty will automatically become effective in additional countries as they submit instruments of ratification.

The Convention, which was drawn up and signed by 21 countries at a U.N. conference held at Geneva in 1949, will simplify formalities and promote international motoring into and through all nations which become party thereto.

Motorists in participating countries will enjoy the convenience and safety of uniform privileges on such matters as motor vehicle registration certificates, drivers' licenses, and customs bonds; the identification of vehicles in international traffic; rules for safe driving; equipment requirements, including brakes, lights, and other technical characteristics; permissible maximum dimensions and weights of motor vehicles; and definitions. In brief, the Convention establishes the principle of international reciprocity for passenger automobiles and for their drivers to the same general end as the reciprocal privileges now existing among the several states of the United States. It is not applicable to commercial trucks and busses. The Convention will not require any changes in motor vehicle laws in this country.

The governors of all the States are being notified that the Convention is now in force in order that proper State agencies may be prepared to assist in the effective operation of its provisions. The American Automobile Association and the American Automobile Touring Alliance are being authorized to issue identification documents provided for in the Convention.

The new Convention is a combination and revision of two previous and obsolete agreements which were concluded at Paris in 1926—the Convention Relative to Motor Traffic and the Convention Relative to Road Traffic. The United States was not a party to either of these Conventions because of nonrecognition therein of the Federal-State relationship. The United States took an active part in the formulation of the 1949 Convention and in many respects it reflects United States practices and recommendations. The new Convention was ratified by the President of the United States on October 17, 1950, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Czechoslovakia was one of the nations which participated in the U. N. conference in 1949, and its ratification was deposited with the United Nations on November 3, 1950. Under existing conditions, however, it is not expected any Czechoslovakian tourists will travel in the United States, nor any private U. S. citizens in Czechoslovakia. Passport and visa controls, which are not affected by the Convention on Road Traffic, will continue to govern the movement of individuals between the United States and all other countries.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Calendar of Meetings¹

Adjourned During March 1952

"Colombo Plan" Exhibition	Colombo	Feb. 15-Mar. 31
British Commonwealth Scientific Official Conference	Canberra and Melbourne	Feb. 18-Mar. 7
ILO (International Labor Organization):		
Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers: 2d Session	Geneva	Feb. 18-Mar. 1
Governing Body: 118th Session	Geneva	Mar. 3-15
Application of Conventions and Recommendations, Committee of Experts on the	Geneva	Mar. 17-29
ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization):		
3d European-Mediterranean Regional Air Navigation Meeting	Paris	Feb. 26-Mar. 25*
UN (United Nations):		
Trusteeship Council: 10th Session	New York	Feb. 27-Mar. 29*
Economic and Social Council:		
Economic Commission for Europe: 7th Session	Geneva	Mar. 3-15
Subcommission on Freedom of Information and of the Press: 5th Session	New York	Mar. 3-21
Special Session of the Council	New York	Mar. 24 (1 day)
Committee on Nongovernmental Organizations	New York	Mar. 18-21
Technical Assistance Committee, Working Party	New York	Mar. 24-28
UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization):		
Executive Board: 28th Session	Paris	Mar. 3-22
Inter-American Seminar on Human Rights	Habana	Mar. 11-31
Special Committee Meeting of the International Sugar Council	London	Mar. 3-11
First General Assembly of the International Mathematical Union	Rome	Mar. 6-8
Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia, Consultative Committee on (Colombo Plan):		
Officials Meeting	Karachi	Mar. 10-23
Ministerial Meeting	Karachi	Mar. 24-28
Caribbean Fisheries Conference	Trinidad	Mar. 24-28

In Session as of March 31, 1952

International Materials Conference	Washington	Feb. 26, 1951-
Four Power Conference on Swiss-Allied Accord	Bern	Mar. 5, 1951-
West Point Sesquicentennial	West Point	Jan.-
ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization):		
Air Navigation Commission: 9th Session	Montreal	Jan. 29-
Council: 15th Session	Montreal	Jan. 29-
Tripartite Conference on Aid to Yugoslavia: 2d Conference	Washington	Feb. 19-
International Conference on German Debts	London	Feb. 28-
2d Pakistan International Industries Fair	Karachi	Mar. 1-
Van Reibeeck Festival Fair	Capetown	Mar. 14-
UN (United Nations):		
General Assembly Interim Committee	New York	Mar. 17-
Economic and Social Council:		
Commission on the Status of Women: 6th Session	Geneva	Mar. 24-
Inter-American Conference on Social Security: 4th Session	México, D.F.	Mar. 24-
International Cattle Exposition	Habana	Mar.-

Scheduled April 1-June 30, 1952

ITU (International Telecommunication Union):		
CCIR International Radio Consultative Committee:		
Study Group I	The Hague	Apr. 1-*
Study Group III	The Hague	Apr. 1-*

¹ Prepared in the Division of International Conferences, Department of State, Mar. 25, 1952.

*Tentative.

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

Scheduled April 1–June 30, 1952—Continued

ITU* (International Telecommunication Union)—Continued

CCIR International Radio Consultative Committee—Continued

Study Group V

Study Group VI

Study Group XI

Administrative Council: 7th Session

Stockholm	May 15–
Stockholm	May 15–
Stockholm	May 19–
Geneva	Apr. 21–

FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization):

Agriculture Extension Workers, 2d Training Course

Working Party on Rice Breeding: 3d Meeting

Working Party on Fertilizers: 2d Meeting

International Rice Commission: 3d Meeting

Meeting on Fisheries Statistics

Committee on Commodity Problems

European Forestry and Forest Products Commission: Meeting of Experts on Torrent Control

Council: 15th Session

FAO-Caribbean Commission, Meeting on Home Economics and Education in Nutrition

San José	Apr. 6–
Bandung, Indonesia	May 5–
Bandung, Indonesia	May 5–
Bandung, Indonesia	May 12–
Copenhagen	May 26–
Rome	June 3–
Rome	June 28–
Rome	June 9–
Port-of-Spain	June 30–

UN (United Nations):

International Children's Emergency Fund (ICEF):

Committee on Consultative Status for UNICEF Advisory Committee of Nongovernmental Organizations

ICEF-Who Joint Committee on Health Policy

Working Party on the Creation of a General Fund Raising Committee

Program Committee

Committee on Administrative Budget

Executive Board

New York	Apr. 8–
New York	Apr. 9–
New York	Apr. 11–
New York	Apr. 14–
New York	Apr. 18–
New York	Apr. 22–

Economic and Social Council:

Committee on Nongovernmental Organizations

Human Rights Commission: 8th Session

Commission on Narcotic Drugs: 7th Session

Social Commission: 8th Session

14th Session of the Council

Technical Assistance Committee

New York	Apr. 8–
New York	Apr. 14–
New York	Apr. 15–
New York	May 12–
New York	May 13–
New York	June –

International Exhibition of Drawings and Engravings

Inter-American Indian Institute: Meeting of Governing Board

Milan International Trade Fair

4th Inter-American Travel Congress

Lugano, Switzerland	Apr. 10–
México, D.F.	Apr. 10–
Milan	Apr. 12–
Lima	Apr. 12–

ILO (International Labor Organization):

5th Regional Conference of American States Members of the ILO

Metal Trades Committee: 4th Session

Iron and Steel Committee: 4th Session

Governing Body: 119th Session

35th International Labor Conference

Governing Body: 120th Session

South Pacific Commission: 9th Session

Lyon International Trade Fair, 34th

Pan American Sanitary Organization Executive Committee: 16th Meeting

Rio de Janeiro	Apr. 17–
Geneva	Apr. 21–
Geneva	May 5–
Geneva	May 26–
Geneva	June 4–
Geneva	June 30–
Nouméa	Apr. 18–
Lyon	Apr. 19–
Washington	Apr. 21–

Cannes International Film Festival

6th International Hydrographic Conference

Caribbean Commission: 14th Meeting

Cannes	Apr. 23–
Monaco	Apr. 29–
Guadeloupe	May 5–

Who (World Health Organization):

5th Assembly

Executive Board: 10th Session

Rubber Study Group: 9th Meeting

Sample Fairs

Geneva	May 5–
Geneva	May 28–
Ottawa	May 5–
Valencia	May 10–
Barcelona	June 10–

UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization):

Executive Board: 29th Session

NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization):

Planning Board for Ocean Shipping: 4th Meeting

South Pacific Commission Fisheries Conference

UPU (Universal Postal Union):

13th Congress

International Cotton Advisory Committee: 11th Plenary Meeting

ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization):

Standing Committee on Aircraft Performance: 2d Meeting

6th Session of the Assembly

9th International Congress of Agricultural Industries

International Conference on Large Electric High-Tension Systems: 14th Session

Paris	May 10–
Washington	May 12–
Nouméa	May 14–
Brussels	May 14–
Rome	May 17–
Copenhagen	May 19–
Montreal	May 27–
Rome	May 23–
Paris	May 28–
Jerusalem	May –

*Tentative.

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

Scheduled for April 1–June 30, 1952—Continued

Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe: 3d Session.	Geneva	May –
Canadian International Trade Fair	Toronto	June 2–
International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property	Vienna	June 2–
International Commission for the Regulation of Whaling: 4th Meeting	London	June 3–
International Meeting of Tonnage Measurement Experts	The Hague	June 4–
Inter-American Commission of Women: 8th General Assembly	Rio de Janeiro	June 8–
21st Session of the International Criminal Police Commission	Stockholm	June 9–
26th Biennial International Exhibition of Art	Venice	June 14–
International Philatelic Exhibition	Utrecht	June 28–
International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries: 2d Annual Meeting.	St. Andrews	June 30–*
	(New Brunswick)	

*Tentative.

NATO Observes Third Anniversary

[Released to the press March 26]

Plans for a ceremony in observance of the third anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty were announced on March 26 by the Department of State. The ceremony will take place on April 4, as the defensive alliance enters its fourth year, from 10:30 a.m. to 12 m. in Constitution Hall at Washington, D.C.

Among the participants will be the President of the United States, Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder, Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett, and Director for Mutual Security W. Averell Harriman.

Present at the ceremony will be His Royal Highness the Prince of the Netherlands, members of the diplomatic corps from nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the NATO military standing group, the NATO military representatives, and Members of Congress. Other leaders in public and private life will also be present.

Committee on Economic Development In South and Southeast Asia

[Released to the press March 24]

A ministerial level meeting of the Consultative Committee on Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia—the body which periodically examines the progress of the Colombo Plan—opened on March 24. At the invitation of the Government of Pakistan the meeting is being held at Karachi and is expected to last one week. The following countries are expected to attend the meeting: Australia, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, India, New Zealand, Pakistan, United Kingdom, United States, and Vietnam.

The U.S. representative to the meeting is Avra M. Warren, U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan. Ambassador Warren's alternate, and U.S. representa-

tive at the preparatory meeting of officials which began on March 10, is Wilfred Malenbaum, Chief of the Investment and Economic Development Staff of the Department of State. Advisers to the U.S. representatives at both meetings are Myron L. Black of the American Embassy at Colombo, John A. Loftus of the Embassy at New Delhi, Henry W. Spielman of the Embassy at Karachi, and Alfred W. Wells of the Embassy at Rangoon. The United States participated as a member of the Committee in its meeting at Colombo in January 1951.

The Consultative Committee is to consider the progress of the Colombo Plan in the period since its formal inauguration in July 1951, any alterations in the 6-year programs in the light of changed circumstances, and detailed programs for the first 2 years.

The Consultative Committee functions in an advisory and consultative capacity. The 6-year economic development programs submitted by member countries in South and Southeast Asia and subsequent modifications of those plans are presented to the Committee for discussion. No international control is exercised upon the individual plans by the Committee. Among the advantages arising from the Committee discussion are the opportunities for each country to compare its development program with others and to exchange information on common problems. No funds are channeled through the Committee, all foreign assistance programs being arranged bilaterally between donor and recipient governments through normal diplomatic channels.

The United States welcomes these efforts to promote cooperative measures for economic development in the area.

The U.S. in the U.N.

will not appear in this issue

The U.S. Foreign Service—A Career for Young Americans

A number of Department and Foreign Service officers, in carrying out an intensive recruitment campaign, are addressing scores of college graduating classes on the subject of Foreign Service careers. At the same time, these officers are leaving with the students copies of a new booklet just issued by the Department of State called *The U.S. Foreign Service—A Career for Young Americans*.¹ The primary purpose of the booklet is to draw the interest of political candidates toward the Foreign Service. It tells them, for example, what the Foreign Service is all about, why it is as satisfying a career as any person can choose, what the Foreign Service expects of them, and what they can expect of the Foreign Service.

The following article is based on excerpts from the booklet.

A great deal has been written about the Foreign Service in the popular literature of today. At times, of course, working abroad has its difficulties and monotonies; at other times, there is sparkle and adventure. But at all times the Foreign Service provides a responsible job—with opportunities limited only by your own ability, ambition, and imagination.

You'll travel a lot in the Foreign Service. You'll see places and people you hardly knew existed. You'll learn much in the Foreign Service—not only about places and people but also about the great issues and world realities which we face in this latter half of the twentieth century.

You'll be paid well in the Foreign Service, but you won't get rich—not in money. You'll have stimulating work, a variety of interesting environments, and opportunities to move ahead, as you show ability to take on more responsible assignments, throughout your career. You will also have security, ample leave time, extra allowances when necessary, and a liberal retirement plan. You'll make good and lasting friendships and you'll collect an inestimable fund of general knowledge about the world.

Above all, you, as a Foreign Service officer, a representative of all the American people, will be serving your country in a position of trust, thus bringing a direction and a meaning into your life which cannot fail to be a source of deep personal satisfaction.

¹ Department of State publication 4559.

A Challenge

The typical Foreign Service officer today usually enters the Service soon after he finishes college. He and all his colleagues start in class 6, the bottom of the ladder—at about \$350 a month—and progress through the classes. He is the career man, the all-around Foreign Service man. He may—and probably will in the course of his career—be called upon to perform a variety of duties, from getting a fellow citizen out of jail to conducting highly important negotiations concerning top foreign-policy matters.

To become this person, you must be, as of July 1—

- . . . At least 20 and under 31 years of age
- . . . An American citizen (and have been one for at least 10 years)
- . . . If married, married to an American citizen

In addition, you will have to pass a written, an oral, and a physical examination. But if you are in good health, have the equivalent of a sound college education and a reasonable measure of general knowledge, and are not afraid of competition, then the tests are a challenge, not a trial.

Your Job as a Foreign Service Officer

The professional activities of a Foreign Service officer are varied. For example, he keeps his Government informed of the multitudinous developments abroad. He protects American citizens and American interests in foreign countries. He cultivates and maintains friendly relations with peoples of other nations. He negotiates treaties, conventions, and protocols regarding international trade, tariffs, shipping, commerce, and the preservation of peace according to the instructions of his Government.

Specifically, your assignments as a Foreign Service officer will include any or all of the following:

- . . . Negotiations with foreign officials
- . . . Political reporting
- . . . Economic reporting in the fields of labor, finance, transportation, communications, aviation, petroleum, etc.
- . . . Commercial reporting and trade promotion
- . . . Agricultural reporting
- . . . Issuance of visas and passports
- . . . Assistance to American shipping

- ... Protection of American citizens and property
- ... Dissemination of informational materials via press, radio, motion pictures, and publications
- ... Assistance in undertaking exchange-of-persons programs
- ... Distribution of educational, scientific, and cultural information and material via libraries and cultural centers
- ... Participation in technical-assistance programs

In addition, you will have numerous executive and administrative duties in connection with the maintenance and operation of offices abroad and may engage in specialized area and language activities.

To help you prepare for these duties, to develop your capacities to the maximum extent, and to broaden your professional knowledge and experience, you will find many opportunities afforded, including carefully designed programs of orientation and training prior to first assignment abroad; both "refresher" and advanced foreign-affairs instruction at intermediate levels in your career; a variety of functional and geographic assignments; and special career-development activities such as advanced training in economics, language and area specialization, or even assignments to the National War College.

The Examinations

You will find the Foreign Service examinations challenging. While you are taking them, somewhere along the line you will wish you had consulted your dictionary more often, that you had read just a little more on this or that subject, that you had paid somewhat more attention to Professor Doe.

But one thing we might say here: A painstaking accumulation of knowledge of foreign affairs and foreign languages will be of no avail to you if you do not impress the examiners as a man who can think and express himself clearly and logically, who has imagination and perceptive insights into human behavior, and who has the kind of intellectual balance and sound judgment which will carry him successfully through difficult situations.

Such a man, with a good general education, need have no fears concerning the Foreign Service examinations.

Where and When

The first step toward becoming a Foreign Service officer is to submit an application. You can do this any time after March 1 of the year in which the examination is held. To obtain the

application form, write to: *Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.*

The deadline for receipt of applications is July 1 of the year in which the examination is to be taken. This means that your application must actually be received by the Board of Examiners by July 1. It is not enough merely to mail the application by that date. It is up to you to get your application into the mail early enough to arrive in the Department of State by July 1; otherwise it cannot be considered.

The written examination will be held in September at Civil Service examination centers in about 15 cities in the continental United States. Ordinarily these include Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, Dallas, Denver, Los Angeles, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, St. Paul, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D.C. You can also take the examination in Honolulu, in San Juan, Puerto Rico, and at any American diplomatic post or consulate.

The oral examination is held in Washington in the spring of each year.

The physical examination is taken after a candidate has passed both the written and oral examinations.

A Closing Note

In a recent interview with a number of young Foreign Service officers—class 6—who had just returned to Washington after completing their first 2-year assignment abroad, one question put to each was, "Well, what do you think of the Foreign Service now?" Every one of these young Foreign Service officers agreed that, long before the first tour of duty was over, he was positive he had embarked on a unique and exciting career. As one of them summed it up:

"There are a number of reasons that draw us to the Foreign Service—the travel, visiting foreign lands and talking with different peoples, the adventure, the interest in international affairs and in America's role in them, and the desire to serve the Nation in a responsible and often quite difficult job.

"All these things are there. But once you're in the Foreign Service, there is something else you become aware of after a short time. It's more than *esprit de corps*. It's more like an awareness of the greatness of your country and its responsibilities to the world. You feel that even the routine things you do have great significance.

"This makes your job more than a job. It makes it a career in the full sense of the word. That's why, long before your leave is up, you are anxious to be on the way to your next post."

Legislation Requested To Handle Overpopulation Problem in Western Europe

*Message of the President to the Congress¹
To the Congress of the United States:*

One of the gravest problems arising from the present world crisis is created by the overpopulation in parts of Western Europe, aggravated by the flight and expulsion of people from the oppressed countries of Eastern Europe.

This problem is of great practical importance to us because it affects the peace and security of the free world. It is also of great concern to us, because of our long-established humanitarian traditions. The Congress has recognized the importance of this problem and has already enacted some legislation to help meet it. I ask the Congress to give early and favorable consideration to additional legislation to make more adequate provision for meeting this situation.

Specifically, I ask the Congress to authorize a program that will:

(1) Provide aid for the unfortunate victims of oppression who are escaping from communist tyranny behind the Iron Curtain,

(2) Continue our participation in the international effort now being made to assist in the migration and resettlement throughout the world of a substantial number of persons from the overpopulated areas of Western Europe, and

(3) Authorize additional immigration into this country, on a limited basis, to aid in alleviating the problems created by communist tyranny and overpopulation in Western Europe.

The solution to these problems cannot, and should not, be the responsibility of any one nation. It is an international responsibility—an integral part of the world crisis which the free nations must meet together. It demands the cooperative efforts of all interested countries. But a real solution can be found only if the United States does its part. We have done our part in the past—we must not falter now.

World War II left in its wake a tremendous upheaval of populations in the countries of Europe. To meet the situation, this country took the lead in establishing the International Refugee Organization, which provided care and protection for displaced persons and made possible the migration

of more than one million of them to 48 countries throughout the free world.

As our own contribution to the common effort, the Congress in 1948 enacted the Displaced Persons Act and subsequently amended and extended it. Both the Congress and the American people have every right to be proud of the achievements made under this farsighted humanitarian legislation.

The Displaced Persons Act is now approaching the termination date fixed by the Congress. When operations under this law have been finished, almost 400,000 victims of tyranny will have been resettled in the United States. The first major phase of the program was completed with the issuance of practically all of the 341,000 visas authorized to be issued by midnight, December 31, 1951. In addition, the Congress authorized the admission of 54,744 Germans who had fled or been driven from areas east of the Iron Curtain. There is every likelihood that the remaining visas for these German expellees will be issued ahead of the June 30, 1952, deadline set by the Congress.

The job has been well done by the Displaced Persons Commission and other cooperating agencies of the Government. Much of the success of the program is due to the vital work accomplished by private voluntary agencies, representing our major religious faiths and nationality groups, and by the State Commissions appointed by the Governors of 34 States. These organizations of citizens have contributed their efforts and resources to resettling the greater part of the displaced persons admitted to this country. Without them, and without the goodwill and cooperative response of thousands of American families and church groups, this great program could never have been carried out.

Thus, by doing our own share and by acting together with the other countries of the free world, we have been dealing successfully with the major dislocations caused by Hitler's policies of brutality and aggression.

But the movement of large masses of distressed people across international boundaries is by no means over. Communist tyranny has taken up where Hitler's brutality left off. We are, therefore, now turning our attention to the innocent and unhappy victims of communist oppression.

¹ H. doc. 400; transmitted Mar. 24.

The Victims of Communist Tyranny

Throughout the Soviet dominated area of central and eastern Europe, the communist regimes are increasing their repressive measures. Some of the enslaved people are managing to escape to the West. Some fifteen to twenty thousand Germans are slipping over the border from the Soviet Zone of Germany and crossing into Western Germany every month. From the communist countries to the south and east the movement to free Europe is much smaller, but still they come, at the risk of their lives, past border guards and through mine fields. There are about 18,000 of these people already West of the Iron Curtain, and they are coming in at the rate of about 1,000 a month.

The people in all these groups come into areas where, for the most part, the local economy is unable to support the population already there. Western Germany, for example, is overcrowded with almost nine million people of German ethnic origin who were driven there from Eastern Europe after the war. Trieste, which is receiving many of those escaping from the satellites, is badly overcrowded. Italy is struggling with very serious problems of overpopulation and is urgently trying to resettle large numbers of its people overseas. Greece faces great difficulty in absorbing the refugees of Greek origin who are being driven out of the Balkan satellites by the communists. Thus, the brutal policies of Soviet tyranny are aggravating overcrowded conditions which are already a danger to the stability of these free nations.

This in general terms, is the nature of the problem that now confronts free Europe.

The Congress is aware of the importance of this problem for the free world and the security of the United States. Congressional enactments and appropriations recently enabled the United States to take the lead in establishing the Provisional Inter-Governmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe, which 17 governments have already joined. This organization is already at work providing overseas transportation for migrants from areas of overpopulation to lands where more people are needed.

We are taking part in the work of this organization and have contributed ten million dollars to its operation. The organization has taken over the fleet of ships formerly operated by the International Refugee Organization.

The legal authority to participate in this organization is contained in the Mutual Security Act of 1951. This authority should be extended, and the Congress should make provision for continuing our financial contribution to this work for the next fiscal year.

This is of great importance, but much more needs to be done.

In the first place, specific aid and assistance should be provided for the people who are fleeing at the risk of their lives from Southern and Eastern Europe. These people are Balts, Poles,

Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Albanians, Ukrainians, and Russians.

These people face a desperate situation. Not only do they arrive destitute, with only what they can carry on their backs, but they find themselves in totally strange lands among strange peoples speaking strange languages. The local authorities do not have adequate resources to care for them properly. These people need better care when they first arrive and they need assistance if they are to move on and resettle elsewhere.

The miserable conditions in which these fugitives from communism find themselves, and their present inability to emigrate to new homes and start new lives, lead inevitably to despair. Their disillusionment is being effectively exploited by communist propaganda. These men and women are friends of freedom. They include able and courageous fighters against communism. They ask only for an opportunity to play a useful role in the fight for freedom. It is the responsibility of the free world to afford them this opportunity.

The need is well recognized, both in Europe and in this country. Private welfare organizations of American citizens, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish, have been working hard to help these people. Last year, these organizations spent substantial amounts for their care and resettlement. These organizations will continue their efforts this year. But the need is greater than they can handle.

First of all, these fugitives from communism need supplemental care and maintenance after they arrive in Western Europe. Local governments and private relief organizations give a minimum amount of this type of aid, but their resources are inadequate. Additional food, better shelter, clothing, medical care, legal advice and other kinds of material assistance are needed.

These people also need assistance in financing overseas transportation. The new international migration organization and the American private relief agencies can and do help with this, but a concerted effort is needed to give these people an equal opportunity to share in the migration program. At present, because of inadequate resources, it is these fugitives from communism who have the greatest difficulty in arranging for overseas migration. If funds were provided, and an adequate administrative organization set up, these people would have a better chance to migrate.

Allocation of MSP Funds

I am convinced that we must help these people. Therefore, acting under the authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, I am authorizing the Director for Mutual Security to go forward with a limited program of assistance in this fiscal year. Four million three hundred thousand dollars will be allocated for this purpose. This program will help alleviate the condition of these people in the countries to which they escape and will enable many of them to move out of Europe.

The funds that are being made available will supplement—but not in any sense supersede—the efforts now being made both by the governments of the countries where these people have sought refuge and by private American organizations.

Supplemental care and overseas migration do not, however, constitute all that should be done for those who escape from Eastern Europe. A substantial number of them want to stay in Europe and should have the chance to do so. They should be welcomed in Western Europe and given the opportunity to make their individual contributions to the free world. Many of them will need further education or training so they can prepare themselves for useful and productive work in the North Atlantic community.

I urge the Congress, therefore, to provide clear and adequate authority for the coming fiscal year—together with the necessary funds—so that the program of assistance we are now starting for the refugees from communism can be carried forward and strengthened along the lines that I have mentioned here.

In addition to these types of aid, the opportunity for military service may provide an answer to the problems of a small number of these refugees. Some of these people will be able to enlist in the United States armed forces overseas, under Public Law 597, the so-called Lodge Act of 1950. So far, however, only a handful have been allowed to do this. Security screening requirements have necessarily been high, since each person under the provisions of the Lodge Act is a potential United States citizen. Another type of military service for these people is authorized under section 101 (A) (1) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, which provides that they can be formed into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The question of forming such units presents great administrative and political difficulties, but it has been receiving careful study. Even if it proves possible, however, to create such units, military service could utilize only a relatively small number of these people, and would not eliminate the need for additional measures to use their skills and energies in civilian life.

Such, in brief, are the measures that can help to alleviate the problems of these fugitives from Soviet terror. But these problems, important as they are, are overshadowed by the need for increasing migration from the overcrowded areas of Europe.

Overpopulation and NATO Nations

Overpopulation is one of the major factors preventing the fullest recovery of those countries where it exists. It is a serious drag on the economies of nations belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. A solution to this problem, therefore, becomes vitally necessary to strengthen the defense of the North Atlantic Community.

Our common defense requires that we make the best possible use not only of the material resources of the free world but of our human resources as well. Men and women who cannot be productively employed in the free countries of Europe because of conditions there are a net loss to the strength of the free world. In other countries, where they are needed, these same people could add to the output and growing power of the free nations. But left in idleness as they now are, wasted and hopeless, they become an easy prey to the demagogues of totalitarianism, both right and left.

The bulk of the emigration needed will have to be taken care of by countries other than the United States. Some of the free nations, particularly those with large unsettled areas or undeveloped resources, have a pressing need for large numbers of immigrants to build up their countries and increase their production. Canada and Australia, for example, have already initiated substantial programs of immigration. The Australian immigration program calls for an annual immigration of at least 150,000 persons per year. Canadian absorption in the last year was at the rate of 180,000. Additional opportunities for migrants are opening up, although more slowly, in the Republics of Central and South America.

But the United States can and should take some of the migrants now available in Europe. One of the reasons we lead the free world today is that we are a nation of immigrants. We have been made strong and vigorous by the diverse skills and abilities of the different peoples who have migrated to this country and become American citizens. Past immigration has helped to build our tremendous industrial power. Today, our growing economy can make effective use of additional manpower in various areas and lines of work.

The rapid expansion of our industry and the enlargement of our defense forces have increased the demands on our available manpower reserves. Our industry can readily absorb a limited number of skilled and trained personnel in the years immediately ahead.

In our agriculture particularly, we have a need for additional people. Farm operators and farm workers are essential in our defense effort. Since 1949, there has again been a downward trend in the farm population of the United States. With the resumption of the movement from the farms to the cities, there is a real danger that in the years just ahead our agricultural production may be seriously hampered.

A rich pool of surplus farmers and farm workers exists in the overpopulated areas of Western Europe. Among the expellees in Western Germany there are many agricultural families with no opportunity for employment on the land. In Italy and the Netherlands, too, there are large groups of agricultural workers who cannot find productive employment on the limited arable land available.

Besides farm workers, our experience under the Displaced Persons Act has demonstrated that we can obtain from Europe some trained factory workers, engineers, scientific technicians, and other kinds of specially qualified people whose skills can be put to good use in our economy.

I am convinced that we should welcome to this country a number of those who now must emigrate from Europe. We should do this, not only in our own self-interest but also as a way to reaffirm the great tradition of freedom and opportunity which we have proved in our own experience to be the surest path of progress and prosperity.

In considering the steps to be taken, we should measure the needs of the distressed people in Europe against our own capacity to make good use of additional manpower, and the extent of our international responsibilities. The problem we face is in the nature of an emergency. This emergency can be of limited duration, if we of the free world act wisely and resolutely. The plight of the refugees in Europe and the demands of our national defense are both related to the threat of communist aggression. When that threat wanes, there will be less need for extraordinary measures. But while it persists, we should move promptly and effectively to meet it.

Inadequacy of Existing Immigration Laws

The existing immigration laws are inadequate—both in general and as regards this special problem. The Displaced Persons Act will end this year, and we will be thrown back on the quota system of immigration. So far as the people escaping from communism are concerned, many of them will be completely blocked from coming to this country because their quotas have been “mortgaged” under the Displaced Persons Act, for many years in the future. For example, half of the Latvian quota has been mortgaged ahead three centuries to the year 2274, the Estonian quota through the year 2146, the Lithuanian quota through the year 2087, and the Polish quota through the year 2000.

Furthermore, under present law we will be unable to make any substantial contribution to meeting the problem of overpopulation in Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, or Greece. In the latter countries, for example, where the need is particularly acute, we can admit annually only 5,677 Italians and 310 Greeks under the law as it now stands.

To meet the present emergency, we should enlarge the numbers of immigrants that can be taken in from all these critical areas. I ask the Congress to authorize the admission of some 300,000 additional persons over a three year period. This would include, on an annual basis:

- (1) 7,000 religious and political refugees from communism in eastern Europe;
- (2) 7,500 Greek nationals from Greece;
- (3) 7,500 Dutch from the Netherlands;

- (4) 39,000 Italians from Italy and Trieste; and
- (5) 39,000 Germans and persons of German ethnic origin.

Immigration in these amounts and from these sources could readily be absorbed in this country, and together with a far larger volume of immigration to other free countries, would go a long way toward solving the emergency problem in Europe.

While the admission of these particular groups should constitute a temporary program of limited duration, it could well be fitted into desirable permanent changes in our present immigration quota system if the Congress finds itself able to make such changes at this session.

Our present quota system is not only inadequate to meet present emergency needs, it is also an obstacle to the development of an enlightened and satisfactory immigration policy for the long-run future. If our quotas were revised and made more flexible, they could probably be utilized to take care of most or all of the immigration required to meet the present emergency situation. The balance, if any, could be admitted without reference to quota numbers. These are considerations that the Congress will wish to keep in mind when it takes up the question of improving our overall immigration laws.

It is most important to remember, however, that action to meet the emergency problem is needed this year. If the Congress cannot agree at this session on desirable improvements in our whole system of immigration that would take care of the emergency problem, it should act to take care of the emergency directly. In no event should this vital emergency program be tied to or associated with restrictive changes in our permanent immigration laws—changes which would in themselves hamper or nullify the operation of the emergency program.

Operation of Displaced Persons Act

In addition to this emergency three-year program, I recommend that steps be taken to alleviate an unfortunate situation arising under the operation of the Displaced Persons Act. Although all visas authorized for displaced persons were issued, some 7,500 of them were lost because the persons to whom they were granted did not actually come to the United States. On the other hand, a number of persons who were seeking admission under the Act, and whose applications were under consideration, were unable to obtain visas prior to the time the authority to issue such visas expired on December 31, 1951. A substantial portion of these applicants were admissible under the standards of the Act, and would have made as good immigrants as those already admitted. The voluntary agencies or individual citizens have given the assurances necessary for the admission of these persons. There is still place for them in the United States.

It seems unjust and unwise to deprive them of the opportunity for which they are qualified. Seven thousand five hundred visas should be ample to take care of the displaced persons in this category. I recommend that the Congress authorize up to that number of visas for them.

In carrying out this proposal, and the three-year emergency program as well, we should follow the lessons of the successful experience we have had under the Displaced Persons Act. The same kind of provision should be made, for example, for security safeguards with respect to those admitted to this country, for means to effect their settlement here on a wide geographic basis, and for safeguards against displacement of United States citizens from housing or employment. And similarly, as under the Displaced Persons Act, there should be no religious, racial or other discrimination in the selection of the immigrants.

With respect to the financing of the emergency three-year program, however, the situation is rather different from that under the Displaced Persons Act, where transportation was financed through Government funds.

Except for the refugees from communism, the people from the overpopulated areas, who constitute the bulk of the migrants to be admitted, are in a better financial position than the displaced persons of former years. They are not stateless,

or dependent wholly on charity. Their countries are interested in seeing them migrate and can be called on to help with the expense of getting them started. The migrants themselves can be asked to repay the cost of their overseas transportation, once they have resettled. Some of them have assets of their own which can be used. While it may be advisable to provide a source of funds to be loaned to these migrants to pay for their passage, the net additional cost to this Government of transporting the people from the overpopulated areas should be small.

The years through which we are passing are tragic years for many people. We are faced with extraordinary problems which demand extraordinary solutions. The problem of the refugees from communist tyranny and that of overpopulation in Western Europe are matters of practical concern to the entire free world. To us in America, whose most basic belief is in the inherent worth of the human individual, these problems present a challenge as well as a responsibility.

The programs I have here recommended are designed to meet the challenge and accept the responsibility. I hope that the Congress will give them prompt and favorable consideration.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 24, 1952.

Transfer of Responsibilities to Mutual Security Director

[Released to the press by the White House March 27]

The President, on March 27, sent identical letters concerning the duties of the Director for Mutual Security to Tom Connally, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and James P. Richards, Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The text of the President's letter follows, together with the text of an appended report by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget:

LETTER TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Pursuant to section 502 (c) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (P. L. 165, 82d Cong., 1st sess., approved October 10, 1951), I hereby inform the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate (Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives) that I have found that, except as hereinafter set forth, all of the powers, functions, and responsibilities transferred to the Director for Mutual Security by subsection (b) (2) of section 502 of said act are necessary to enable the Director for Mutual Security, after June 30, 1952, to carry out the duties conferred upon him by section 503 of said act.

Powers, functions, and responsibilities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, with respect to the following are not necessary to enable the said Director, after June 30, 1952, to carry out the duties so conferred upon him:

1. Creation of a corporation (section 104 (d)).
2. Consultation with the Secretary of State in the specific manner prescribed in section 105 (b).
3. Consultation between the chief of the special mission and the chief of the United States diplomatic mission in the specific manner prescribed in section 109 (b).
4. Guarantee of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media (section 111 (b) (3)).
5. Procurement and increased production in participating countries, and under sections 115 (i) (1) and 117 (a), of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in the resources within the United States; and purchase, under section 115 (i) (2), of strategic and critical materials in any participating country.

6. Promotion and development of travel by citizens of the United States to and within participating countries (section 117 (b)).

7. Payment of ocean freight charges of relief supplies and packages (section 117 (d)).

The findings under section 502 (c) have been framed in terms of a specification of powers to be discontinued rather than powers to be continued. This approach has been adopted because by the enactment of section 503 the Congress has already limited the range of the Director's responsibilities with respect to the activities of the Mutual Security Agency, thereby anticipating the action which had originally been contemplated would result from the finding under section 502 (c).

The Congress, in the Mutual Security Act, reaffirmed the proposition that the mutual security efforts of the free world should not fail because some cooperating countries cannot now provide all the physical and final resources required for defense mobilization. The Mutual Security Agency already has adjusted its programs and organization, and has curtailed some functions and modified others in order to direct its full effort to the objectives of the mutual security program. Under section 502 (b) (2) of the act, however, the Mutual Security Agency now is using to support mutual defense the same major powers and functions which originally were needed to assist economic recovery. This experience has shown that the basic powers of the Economic Cooperation Act, appropriately redirected toward the new objectives, are necessary to enable the Director for Mutual Security after June 30, 1952, to carry out his responsibilities under section 503 of the Mutual Security Act. Those provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act which are not required for this purpose are set forth in the above finding.

Although the Mutual Security Agency's authority to subsidize relief shipments and to make guarantees of informational media investments will be discontinued, it is essential that these activities be carried on after June 30, 1952. There has been submitted for the consideration of the Congress as a part of the 1953 mutual security legislation a request for authority and funds which would permit the President to designate any department or agency of the Government to carry on the function of subsidizing relief shipments. At an early date there also will be submitted for the consideration of the Congress a request for authority to enable the Government to continue the work of guaranteeing investments in informational media enterprises.

I am enclosing for your information copies of a report relating to the foregoing prepared by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

MARCH 18, 1952

SUBJECT: *Continuation after June 30, 1952, of powers, functions, and responsibilities established by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and other laws*

I. Introduction and Recommendations

Introduction

Section 502 (c) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 provides as follows:

Not later than April 1, 1952, the President shall inform the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives which of the powers, functions, and responsibilities transferred to the Director by subsection (b) (2) are found by the President to be necessary to enable the Director after June 30, 1952, to carry out the duties conferred upon him by section 503. The termination provisions of section 122 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall come into effect on June 30, 1952, and none of the powers, functions, and responsibilities conferred by that Act shall be exercised after that date, except those powers, functions, and responsibilities found necessary to enable the Director to carry out the duties conferred on him by section 503 of this Act, which powers, functions, and responsibilities unless otherwise provided by law shall continue in effect until June 30, 1954.

Section 503 provides:

After June 30, 1952, the Director, on behalf of the President and subject to his direction, shall, in consultation with the Secretaries of State and Defense, continue to have primary responsibility for—

(a) the development and administration of programs of assistance designed to sustain and increase military effort, including production, construction, equipment and matériel in each country or in groups of countries which receive United States military assistance;

(b) the provision of such equipment, materials, commodities, services, financial, or other assistance as he finds to be necessary for carrying out mutual defense programs; and

(c) the provision of limited economic assistance to foreign nations for which the United States has responsibility as a result of participation in joint control arrangements when the President finds that the provision of such economic assistance is in the interest of the security of the United States.

The Bureau of the Budget has examined the current and prospective programs and operations of the Mutual Security Agency to ascertain which of the various powers, functions and responsibilities established by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and related laws are necessary for the Director for Mutual Security to carry out after June 30, 1952, the responsibilities enumerated in section 503 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. The following recommendations are concurred in by the Director for Mutual Security, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the various powers, functions, and responsibilities previously vested in the Economic

Cooperation Administrator and transferred to the Director by the Mutual Security Act, except for those noted below, be continued after June 30, 1952. The Bureau of the Budget has concluded that, although the purposes to which assistance is being directed have changed under the mutual security program, the major functions authorized under the Economic Cooperation Act must be utilized to accomplish the new goals.

The powers of the China Aid Act of 1948 and the China Area Aid Act of 1950 also will be needed by the Director after June 30, 1952, to carry out his responsibilities.

The Mutual Security Agency already has adjusted many of its operations and recast some of its functions in order to fulfill its new assignment. The performance of many of the functions which must be continued may be further modified. However, the following powers, functions, and responsibilities established by the Economic Cooperation Act do not appear to be necessary to enable the Director to carry out his duties after June 30: to create a corporation (section 104 (d)); to furnish informational media guarantees (section 111 (b) (3)); to promote travel by United States citizens in participating countries (section 117 (b)); to pay ocean freight charges of relief packages and supplies (section 117 (c)); to promote procurement and increased production in participating countries of materials in which the United States is deficient (sections 115 (i) and 117 (a)); to consult with the Secretary of State in the specific manner prescribed in section 105; and to participate in the consultation procedure between the chief of the special mission and the chief of the United States diplomatic mission in the specific manner prescribed in section 109 (b).

II. Discussion

A. PURPOSES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE UNDER THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT

By the middle of 1950, the goals of the European Recovery Program in many instances had been substantially achieved. Under new legislation, a start had been made to extend assistance by the United States to countries in the general area of China. The communist aggression in Korea that year, however, forced the free world to accept the additional burden of intensifying preparation to defend against other communist-armed threats. It was recognized, therefore, that our economic aid should be used to augment the security efforts of friendly nations. As rearmament plans were developed, it became apparent that while the purely recovery needs of these countries were diminishing, further economic assistance from the United States beyond the fixed expiration date of the Economic Cooperation Act would be necessary for them to achieve established defense goals. This need for continued assistance in order to achieve more specific security objectives was recognized by the Congress in passing the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

The programs of the Mutual Security Agency now are designed to provide the marginal assistance required to enable countries participating in mutual defense efforts to expand their financial and productive capacity to build their armed forces, to increase the production of military goods, to construct bases, air fields, and other necessary facilities, and to take related actions. By preserving recovery gains, the programs provide the economic base on which defenses are being built, and diminish the possibility that economic dislocations may lead to internal subversion. MSA programs contribute to the security of the Far East by supporting defense activities, and by attacking hunger, sickness, and other causes of the current civil unrest.

The size of our assistance programs in most countries now depends upon a given level of military effort. For European nations, the amount of United States aid planned under bilateral agreements is related to the commitments made by those countries to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization defense arrangements. As a general rule,

funds are released only as the agreed-upon plans are implemented.

The present and projected Mutual Security Agency programs differ markedly from the activities under the recovery program which were directed primarily toward closing the "dollar gap." Economic Cooperation Administration operations previously were designed to increase the production of export goods and to decrease the need for goods produced in the dollar areas. Aid was allotted principally on the basis of assurances to relax trade restrictions, to promote financial stability, to expand foreign trade, and to take other steps to reduce dollar deficits.

B. MODIFICATION OF FUNCTIONS UNDER THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT TO CONFORM TO NEW PROGRAMS

Study of the revised Mutual Security Agency programs has shown that the basic functions which have been necessary to provide assistance for recovery are actually those required to further mutual security objectives. Certain other functions, however, now may be discontinued, and certain others modified in the manner in which they are exercised. The functions which should be continued, and the extent to which others now may be discontinued or modified, are discussed below.

1. All Major Functions Must Be Continued

The major powers and functions of the Economic Cooperation Act, though designed for recovery purposes, have proved through recent experience to be readily adaptable and essential to the new Mutual Security Agency programs directed to military support. They will be needed by the Director for Mutual Security to fulfill his assignment. The following paragraphs cover the principal functions, and briefly explain their changed uses.

Under the Economic Cooperation Act, for example, the Administrator is authorized to furnish aid in the form of commodities and services. Commodities and equipment from this country helped the Marshall Plan nations to recover their economic strength. Although the general composition of commodity aid remains much the same, its end uses have changed in many respects. Coal, machine tools, and other materials from this country now are enabling our allies to manufacture their share of the military weapons and facilities required to support our joint effort. Indeed, without this kind of help, the economic conditions making possible the required military efforts could not be maintained.

Under the authority of the act, technical assistance was provided to export industries and to capital goods manufacturers to increase the dollar earning power of the participating country economies. This identical authority has been used since the enactment of the Mutual Security Act to send American technicians abroad to assist manufacturers of such military goods as combat vehicles, artillery, electronics equipment, ships, weapons, and small arms. In addition, the Mutual Security Agency technical assistance program already has been directed to production problems in defense-supporting industries such as iron and steel, pipe and tube rolling and drawing, iron foundry, forging and stamping, coal mining, oil refining, electroplating, and so on. In the Far East, most kinds of technical assistance have a direct bearing on the security of the area.

The Administrator originally used his power to approve disposition of local currency accounts to guide these funds into channels of investment useful to the economic reconstruction and stability of participating countries. The Congress, in the Mutual Security Act, recognized the potential security uses of local currencies. Sizeable amounts of counterpart are now being released jointly by the United States and participating countries to finance military production, construction, equipment, and matériel. Decisions on the amount of counterpart to be released and its uses will have a direct impact on the size and content of national expenditures, including military budgets.

The Economic Cooperation Act authorizes the transfer

of funds to certain types of international institutions. The authority thus far has been used for contributions to the European Payments Union, which has contributed to the facilitation of trade between European countries. The use of this authority may be necessary in connection with arrangements to clear transactions for the exchange of military items among North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries. These efforts represent a major step toward regional unification.

2. Terms of Assistance

The Administrator is authorized to supply commodities and services in the form of grants, upon payment in cash, on credit terms, or on other terms of payment.

The continuation of the power to furnish assistance under several financial arrangements is essential. The largest part of the aid supplied necessarily must be in grants because many recipient countries are incapable of assuming substantial additional debt. Bankable enterprises in other participating countries are receiving loans from the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which has the funds and authority for foreign lending. To preserve flexibility, the power to provide assistance on other credit terms, including repayment in materials, will continue to be needed.

3. Supporting Functions to be Continued

The Economic Cooperation Act provides for other functions which influence the use of aid, or otherwise contribute to the objectives of economic assistance. Some of these supporting functions are necessary for mutual security purposes.

The act, for example, directs the Administrator to give full publicity regarding assistance including its purpose, source, and character, and Congress otherwise authorized Economic Cooperation Administration information activities of a broad kind to promote the objectives of the recovery program. Information activities supported by the use of counterpart funds will continue to be important to the objectives of the mutual security program and this authorization should be continued. These activities, however, are being geared to the more specific objectives of the mutual security program and are being integrated with related activities so that a single comprehensive United States program is achieved. Steps toward this objective will be continued under procedures established pursuant to section 507 of the Mutual Security Act.

The power to guarantee American investments in countries included in the mutual security program against expropriation and the inability to convert earnings underlies another supporting activity which should be continued. The guarantee program, although not now a major activity in the Mutual Security Agency, will assist in securing the participation of American private investment in the program abroad. Since the Mutual Security Act extends the guarantee authority to all areas of the world to which assistance is being furnished, additional plans to utilize this authority are being considered.

4. Supporting Functions to be Discontinued

Some supporting functions which contributed to the rehabilitation of weakened economies are not needed to achieve mutual defense plans. Therefore, these functions, which are discussed below, either should be terminated or be made a part of the long-range programs of permanent Government agencies.

The Administrator is authorized in the Economic Cooperation Act to work jointly with the Secretary of Commerce to promote travel by United States citizens abroad. Tourist trade for several years has been a major source of dollar earnings for countries in Europe. The dollar gap must, of course, continue to be a matter of profound concern to our national policy: European economic and political health will be jeopardized unless Europe can earn more dollars to buy from us military goods and goods vital to the functioning of its economy. Programs for increasing dollar earnings through promotion of Ameri-

can tourism, however, are remote from the defense support programs of the Mutual Security Agency.

The guarantee of investments in enterprises for the distribution of United States books, magazines, films, and other informational media has increased the supply of such materials abroad. The informational benefits of this program, however, have been of a general kind and are not, therefore, in direct support of the more specific objectives of the mutual security program. Accordingly, this function may now be discontinued in the Mutual Security Agency. There will be submitted for the consideration of the Congress a request for authority to enable the Government to carry on this function.

The Administrator is directed to pay ocean freight charges on relief packages to countries receiving aid. The Economic Cooperation Administration contributed to the shipment abroad of large quantities of private relief supplies which have earned much good will for the United States. In recent years there has been a marked decline in the use of this subsidy. Although this program is an effective auxiliary to our foreign policy, it does not contribute directly to the mutual security program and therefore should not be carried on by the Mutual Security Agency. There has been submitted for the consideration of the Congress as a part of the 1953 mutual security legislation a request for authority and funds to permit the President to designate any department or agency of the Government to carry out this function.

Sections 115 (i) and 117 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act direct the Administrator to promote the procurement and increased production of materials in which the United States is deficient.

There can be no doubt about the importance of increased supplies of strategic and critical materials to the military production of the United States and its allies. The Mutual Security Agency, as part of its country programs, will continue to emphasize and support materials projects through use of direct assistance and counterpart funds. The functions assigned by the act, however, primarily involve increasing production for the United States stockpile. This task is more directly related to other United States programs than to overseas defense support activities.

The President has established a special agency, the Defense Materials Procurement Agency, to increase the production of essential materials both in this country and abroad for use in the United States. Under a recent agreement, DMPA, as agent for the Mutual Security Agency, is operating projects, previously supervised by the Economic Cooperation Administration, the production of which will go to the United States. The DMPA, in close coordination with MSA, but with its own funds and loan authority, can continue to initiate and develop projects of this type. The United States defense buildup will better be served if all the materials development projects primarily related to United States procurement are administered as part of a single, centralized program. The Director for Mutual Security, therefore, will not continue to require the powers contained in sections 115 (i) and 117 (a).

It should be pointed out that section 115 (b) (5) of the Economic Cooperation Act, requiring that bilateral agreements shall make appropriate provision for facilitating the transfer to the United States of deficiency materials, will be continued. Furthermore, through the continuance of section 115 (h), not less than five percent of each counterpart account will continue to be reserved for the use of the United States Government for the purchase of deficiency materials which are required by the United States, and for other purposes.

5. Administrative Functions to be Continued

The Economic Cooperation Administrator, was provided with operating flexibility which contributed substantially to the effective development and administration of a dynamic program of economic recovery. The Director for Mutual Security now is responsible for an equally

dynamic program, and he will continue to need similar administrative authority.

The internal structure of the Economic Cooperation Administration and Mutual Security Agency has been revised as economic assistance objectives and programs have changed. Reductions in MSA personnel have been made beyond the ten percent reduction required by the Mutual Security Act. The special country missions and the European office of the agency have undergone personnel changes in line with revised assignments. MSA staff overseas are engaged in reviewing country capabilities and commodity requirements. They assist European producers to eliminate "bottlenecks" in military production, and they assist United States armed services and their contractors to locate and develop European sources of items to minimize the drain on scarce United States supplies.

In addition to providing customary administrative powers, the Economic Cooperation Act empowers the Administrator to employ persons for overseas service at Foreign Service rates and to have overseas employees appointed to the Foreign Service.

With the exceptions cited below, the Director for Mutual Security will need all the administrative powers in the Economic Cooperation Act to carry on his functions and responsibilities under the Mutual Security Act.

The Economic Cooperation Act required countries to allocate to the use of the United States Government five percent of the counterpart deposited against the grant aid they receive. These funds have been used, under the review of the Bureau of the Budget, to meet administrative and other essential expenses, and the provisions should be continued.

6. Administrative Functions to be Discontinued

The power to create a corporation, with the approval of the President, has never been utilized, and does not seem necessary to the discharge of the Director's responsibilities.

Sections 105 (b) and 109 (b) of the act provide for coordination between the Administrator and the Secretary of State, and between the chief of the special mission and the chief of the United States diplomatic mission, respectively. These provisions have largely been superseded by the Mutual Security Act, but to eliminate possible confusion they should not be continued after June 30, 1952. Section 3 of Executive Order 10300 provides for coordination between the Secretary of State and the Director for Mutual Security in order that mutual security programs shall be carried out in conformity with the established foreign policy of the United States. Under section 507 of the Mutual Security Act, the President is providing for the country-level arrangements to govern the administration of the mutual security program.

C. OTHER LAWS

Several other laws confer powers, functions, and responsibilities on the Economic Cooperation Administrator which now have been transferred to the Director by the Mutual Security Act.

1. The China Aid Act of 1948

The China Aid Act of 1948 authorizes the Administrator to furnish aid to China under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act. It also contains specific provision for the establishment of the Joint Committee on Rural Reconstruction in China. Title III of the Mutual Security Act now provides for aid to the general area of China. The China Aid Act, with the exception of the JCRR provision, does not, of itself, establish any new powers, functions, or responsibilities. The striking success of the JCRR in strengthening the economy of Formosa argues strongly for the retention of the act and its use in support of the mutual defense program now being carried on there. For this reason, it is recommended that the Administrator's functions under the act be continued after June 30, 1952.

2. The China Area Aid Act of 1950

The China Area Aid Act of 1950 assigns to the Administrator responsibility for furnishing aid to countries in the general area of China pursuant to the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act. Aid to that area is now covered by title III of the Mutual Security Act, which similarly authorizes aid to be furnished under applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act. The China Area Aid Act does not establish any new powers; aid furnished pursuant to its provisions depended upon the exercise of powers conferred by the Economic Cooperation Act. There are, however, some residual activities, such as the use of certain counterpart funds, which depend upon the authority originally contained in this act. For that reason, the powers, functions, and responsibilities established by the act need to be kept in legal force for the time being.

3. The Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950

The Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, authorizes the Administrator for Economic Cooperation to furnish assistance to the Republic of Korea pursuant to the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act. The Mutual Security Act, in section 303, provides that the functions of the Administrator under that act shall be performed by such departments or agencies of the Government as the President shall direct.

4. The India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951

The India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951 authorizes and directs the Administrator to provide emergency food relief assistance to India on credit terms. The major part of this task will be accomplished by June 30, 1952. The remaining functions will be liquidated as appropriate under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act.

F. J. LAWTON, Director

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: March 22-28, 1952

Releases may be obtained from the Office of the Special Assistant for Press Relations, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C. Items marked (*) are not printed in the BULLETIN; items marked (†) will appear in a future issue.

No.	Date	Subject
189	3/12	Thorp: Health security
†203	3/18	Commission on status of women
*218	3/22	Death of Ceylon prime minister
*219	3/24	Visitors to U.S.
*220	3/24	Wilkinson, Fso, retires
*221	3/24	Shaw: Ambassador to Paraguay
*222	3/24	Duke: Ambassador to El Salvador
†223	3/24	Pan American railway congress
224	3/24	Property nationalization in Hungary
225	3/24	S. and S.E. Asia consultative comm.
226	3/25	Bruce: Statement on MSP
*227	3/25	Anniversary of Greece
228	3/25	U.S. reply on German peace treaty
229	3/25	Road traffic convention
†230	3/25	Acheson, Dulles: Exchange of letters
231	3/26	Acheson: Reply to Soviet note
232	3/26	Germ warfare in Korea
233	3/26	Panama extends filing-claims date
†234	3/26	Welling: Point 4 director for Jordan
†235	3/26	S. Africa educational exchange
236	3/26	NATO anniversary ceremony
†237	3/27	Gordon: Point 4 director for Ethiopia
238	3/27	Recognition of Cuban Government
†239	3/28	Corbett: Financial policy director
240	3/28	Sargeant: Defending free culture
241	3/28	New VOA filter
242	3/28	Conference in defense of children

American Principles		
How Can We Defend Free Culture? (Sargeant) . . .	535	
American Republics		
CUBA: U.S. recognizes new government . . .	540	
ECUADOR: Export-Import Bank grants housing credit . . .	544	
PANAMA: Filing date extended for claims under U.S.-Panama convention . . .	544	
Asia		
Economic Development Committee to examine progress of Colombo Plan . . .	548	
Claims and Property		
Filing date extended for claims under U.S.-Panama convention . . .	544	
Hungary nationalizes real estate . . .	540	
Communism		
Further denials of Soviet "germ warfare" allegations . . .	529	
How Can We Defend Free Culture? (Sargeant) . . .	535	
Congress		
MESSAGES TO CONGRESS:		
Additional legislation on overpopulation in Western Europe requested . . .	551	
Duties of director of Mutual Security Agency . . .	555	
Current legislation on foreign policy . . .	540	
Europe		
The Council of Europe . . .	523	
FRANCE: A review of political and economic conditions (Bruce) . . .	533	
GERMANY: Reaffirmation of U.S. policy towards, text of U.S. notes, Acheson statement . . .	530	
HUNGARY: Real estate nationalized . . .	540	
Legislation requested on overpopulation (Truman) . . .	551	
U.S.S.R.:		
Further denials of Soviet "germ warfare" allegations . . .	529	
Reaffirmation of U.S. policy towards Germany, text of U.S.-Soviet notes, Acheson statement . . .	530	
VOA has new filter to combat jamming . . .	534	
Finance		
Export-Import Bank grants housing credit to Ecuador . . .	544	
Foreign Service		
Booklet released on the Foreign Service as a career (excerpts) . . .	549	
Health		
Common responsibility for achieving health security (Thorp) . . .	541	
Information and Educational Exchange Program		
How Can We Defend Free Culture (Sargeant) . . .	535	
International Information		
VOA has new filter to prevent jamming . . .	534	
International Meetings		
Calendar of Meetings . . .	546	
Economic Development Committee to meet in Pakistan . . .	548	
International Conference in Defense of Children . . .	540	
Mutual Security		
The Council of Europe . . .	523	
North Atlantic Treaty Organization		
FRANCE: A review of political and economic conditions (Bruce) . . .	533	
Observance of 3d anniversary . . .	548	
Presidential Documents		
CORRESPONDENCE: Duties of director of Mutual Security Agency . . .	555	
Legislation requested on overpopulation in Western Europe . . .	551	
Publications		
Booklet released on the Foreign Service as a career (excerpts) . . .	549	
State Department		
Reaffirmation of U.S. policy toward Germany, Acheson statement, text of U.S.-Soviet notes . . .	530	
Technical Cooperation and Development		
Economic Development Committee to examine progress of Colombo Plan . . .	548	
Treaty Information		
Road traffic convention to aid international motor touring enters into force . . .	545	
United Nations		
WHO: Proposes investigation of Soviet "germ warfare" allegations . . .	529	
Name Index		
Acheson, Secretary Dean . . .	529, 530	
Bruce, David K.E. . . .	533	
Compton, Wilson . . .	534	
Connally, Tom . . .	555	
Lawton, F. J. . . .	555	
Richards, James P. . . .	555	
Sargeant, Howland H. . . .	535	
Thorp, Willard L. . . .	541	
Truman, President Harry S. . . .	551, 555	
Warren, Avra M. . . .	548	